

# THE MONTH

## A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 460 (NEW SERIES 70) OCT., 1902

### CONTENTS

SOME ASPECTS OF CHARITY IN CANADA.....	<i>By Virginia M. Crawford</i>	337
THE OLD FLEMISH MASTERS AT HOME.....	<i>By the Countess de Courson</i>	348
BOY-SAVERS.....	<i>By James Britten, K.S.G.</i>	356
THE SUPPRESSION OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.	<i>By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith</i>	366
THE EARLIEST CULTUS OF OUR LADY AT ROME.	<i>By G. J. Pfachler</i>	377
SOME SIDE-LIGHTS ON THE PRE-HISTORIC PERIOD.	<i>By Professor B. C. A. Windle</i>	391
A SYMPOSIUM ON THE ATONEMENT.....	<i>By the Rev. John Rickaby</i>	397
THE SINCLAIR EXPEDITION TO NORWAY.....	<i>By J. S. Shepard</i>	403
FLOTSAM AND JETSAM .....		416
REVIEWS .....		432
LITERARY RECORD .....		444

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO  
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

# Burns & Oates' New Publications.

*Now Complete with the Fifth Volume.*

## BIOGRAPHICAL HISTORY AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS.

FROM THE BREACH WITH ROME IN 1534 TO THE PRESENT TIME.

By JOSEPH GILLLOW.

In Five Volumes, Demy 8vo, cloth, £3 15s.; or Separate Volumes, 15s. each.

"Mr. Gillow's work will not only be a service to his own community, but will furnish contributions to history."—*Quarterly Review*.

## THE MIRROR OF PERFECTION,

BEING A RECORD OF SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI,

Ascribed to his Companion, Brother LEO OF ASSISI,

AND NOW TRANSLATED BY CONSTANCE, COUNTESS DE LA WARR,

With an Introduction, by Father CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C.

Crown 8vo. Bound in Buckram, gilt, Price 5s. (Ready in a few days.)

## GUIDE TO THE WESTMINSTER CATHEDRAL.

A BRIEF SURVEY OF ITS HISTORY FROM 1865 TO 1902.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS.

Price 6d. net (postage 2d.).

## THE LUKEWARM CHRISTIAN.

TWO SERMONS BY MASSILLON.

ARRANGED AND ABRIDGED BY PERCY FITZGERALD.

Fcap 8vo, cloth, extra gilt, 2s.

## THE HOLY ROSARY

IN THE PRESENCE OF JESUS IN THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

Containing the Fifteen Mysteries illustrated in gold and colours, and aspirations  
suitable to each.

Size 5½ by 3½ inches; bound in leatherette gilt, gilt edges, round corners, 1s. net (postage 1½d.).

## FROM HEARTH TO CLOISTER IN THE REIGN OF CHARLES II.

Being a Narrative of Sir John and Lady Warner's so-much-wondered-at resolutions to  
leave the Anglican Church and to enter the Religious Life.

By FRANCES JACKSON.

Crown 8vo, quarter leather, gilt top, price 5s.

*Newer and Cheaper Edition. Price 1s. net (postage 2d.).*

## ST. TERESA'S OWN WORDS;

OR, INSTRUCTIONS ON THE PRAYER OF RECOLLECTION.

Arranged by the RIGHT REV. BISHOP CHADWICK.

## THE TREASURE OF THE CHURCH.

By THE VERY REV. J. B. CANON BAGSHAW, D.D.

Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt, 3s. 6d.

With a Preface by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Southwark, who says—

"In *The Treasure of the Church*, Canon Bagshawe explains at length, but in a clear and simple manner, the two Sacraments which are in constant use among the faithful—the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist and the Sacrament of Penance. . . . No one can read this book without finding in it a fresher knowledge of his Faith, and a consequent stimulus to live more entirely according to its teaching."

Burns and Oates (Limited), 28, Orchard Street, London, W.

ns

to

4.

le  
st  
a  
at





In respect of the seating capacity of the Church of Notre Dame, Montreal, we have to make the following correction. Our contributor set this down as 15,000. Too hastily assuming that this was a slip of the pen, we altered the figure to 1,500. It appears however that the former was what was meant, and that—whatever may be thought of the limits of possibility even beyond the Atlantic, this estimate has the sanction of the guide-book to Montreal issued this year by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We must therefore recall our supposed emendation and apologize for so far mistrusting our contributor.—ED. THE MONTH.



### *Some Aspects of Charity in Canada.*

---

THERE is a town as French as any town in France, and far more Catholic than any to be found there to-day: the old city of Montreal. The religious enthusiasm and romantic courage which, in the seventeenth century, inspired soldiers and priests and devoted women to plant a colony six hundred miles up the St. Lawrence as an outpost of French civilization and Catholic faith in the midst of the wild Iroquois country, has left its mark to this day, for in spite of a century and a half of British dominion the ancient town of Ville Marie still remains what its founders intended it should be, Catholic and French. Loyal as they are, no people have clung more tenaciously to the characteristics of race and of creed than the French-Canadians in and around Montreal. Up the slope of the hillside, in the newer quarter, English influences may prevail, and the English tongue be spoken, but down by the St. Lawrence and its busy quays, in the shops of Notre Dame Street, stretching from east to west, and in the market to which twice a week the "habitants" of the country-side bring their garden produce, the French tongue alone is to be heard. The tall, narrow houses with their outside shutters, the kiosks for the sale of newspapers, the numerous *cafés* and restaurants, all speak of the needs and the customs of a French population. Nor are the outward signs of their faith wanting. Beside the market, not a stone's throw from the quay, stands the little old Church of Our Lady of Bon Secours, one of the earliest dedications to the Blessed Virgin on Canadian soil. Above, on the crest of the high-pitched roof, a large figure of the Redeemer with uplifted hands has been placed in full view of every ship that enters the port. Within, the old building has been recklessly renovated, but devotion to the shrine still survives, and on market-days a constant stream of country-folk, laden with heavy baskets, passes in and out of the little porch. A few yards to the right lies a delightful hospital, French and Catholic

from cellar to garret, and English only in the one excellent particular that all the nuns hold nursing certificates; and down the street to the left we come upon one of the largest parish churches in the whole world—that of Notre Dame—where seats for fifteen hundred people surely testify to a profoundly Catholic population. But already in Notre Dame the picturesque charm of Montreal is on the wane, and the serried ranks of pretentious benches speak of the New World rather than of the Old.

It is the aggressive newness of American cities, their unhappy mixture of the shabby and the pretentious, the raggedness, so to speak, of their edges, that causes the European visitor to turn to Montreal with a feeling akin to gratitude. The charm is undeniable, but when we come to analyze it, it is simply that the town is French, and two centuries old. From it, and from the sister-city of Quebec, has radiated all that differentiates the Canadians of to-day from their American cousins across the frontier. To Canada, France sent her noblest blood, her bravest soldiers, her most heroic priests, and they brought with them, with other Gallic characteristics, traditions of faith and of Christian charity whose fruits are to be seen to this day. It is due to them that Montreal may still be described without much exaggeration as a city of churches and convents, so numerous and so stately are her ecclesiastical buildings. To them we may trace devotion to St. Anne, which has come to be a national trait of Canadian piety. Imported, no doubt, by sailors and settlers from Brittany, it inspired the building of Ste. Anne de Beaupré, the only pilgrimage church, outside of Mexico, in all North America, and thence, fostered in their many missions by the Oblate Fathers of Mary Immaculate and by the Faithful Companions of Jesus, whose own mother-house is at Ste. Anne d'Auray, and who were not likely to neglect their patroness in their exile, it has spread from Atlantic to Pacific.

Nothing, however, betrays the French blood in the Canadian people so much—though to-day the statement sounds almost paradoxical—as the growth and the influence of the religious orders. They have thriven under English rule and English liberty, but their spirit is essentially French, and there can be no doubt that the remarkable survival of French language and customs throughout the Dominion is due in no small measure to them. Were M. Combes Prime Minister of Canada

to-day, he would indeed have his hands full, for, in the French-speaking provinces, education—from Laval University down to the village school—is wholly in the hands of religious congregations. One is immediately struck, travelling in Canada, by the prestige that ecclesiastics, and still more nuns, enjoy on every side, a prestige due, no doubt, in part to the admirable work they perform, but also in part to a tradition inherited from their great spiritual founders in the past. The most fascinating pages of French-Canadian history—and the history is one of the most romantic in the world—tell of the women, many of high birth, who, with all a Frenchwoman's instinctive clinging to home and distrust of the unknown, braved the horrors of the Atlantic voyage in the seventeenth century, and the hardships of exile, to minister to the wants of the early settlers, and to help in carrying the truths of Christianity to the savage Indian tribes. As early as 1639, three Ursulines—one of them that Mère Marie de l'Incarnation whom Bossuet described as the St. Teresa of New France—landed in Quebec, the pioneers of Canadian education for women, in which the Order still holds a foremost place. With them came three Augustinian Sisters—sent at the expense of that Duchesse d'Aiguillon who was niece to Cardinal Richelieu and a penitent of St. Vincent de Paul—the founders of the Hotel-Dieu of Quebec, the stateliest of all her conventual establishments to-day. Two years later, in 1641, a heroic Frenchwoman, Mdle. Jeanne Mance, accompanied de Maisonneuve in his intrepid journey up the St. Lawrence, and established in the newly-founded city of Montreal a hospital under the care of the Sisters of St. Joseph, who nurse there to this day. At the same date there came into existence the Canadian Congregation of Notre Dame, whose schools are now scattered over the Dominion, and who claim to teach some twenty-five thousand children.

Such continuity of growth, with no falling away in zeal or devotion, testifies to the strong religious faith of the nation, and to the possession of a high spiritual ideal. But the Canadians have done more than perpetuate the good works of their adventurous ancestors; they have been zealous in founding fresh ones for themselves. There stands out a Congregation, French indeed by spirit and tradition, but wholly Canadian by birth and development, which more than any other is typical of the best that religious life in Canada can produce. The *Sœurs Grises* across the Atlantic are very much what the

Sisters of Charity are to Western Europe, and the attractive habit of a soft *café au lait* shade, with the close black cap of the former, is as familiar a sight throughout the Dominion, as are the white *cornettes* of the daughters of St. Vincent de Paul with us. The Grey Sisters are to be found everywhere, they are loved everywhere, they are ready to turn their hand to any good work. They possess a splendid tradition of active service for the poor ; their methods have stood the test of generations, and their training is founded on the accumulated experience of one hundred and fifty years. Yet there is nothing rigid or pedantic in their rule ; in all that is good they are abreast of the times, and their great institutions are built in accordance with the latest requirements of hygiene and sanitary laws, their schools and hospitals are fitted with the most recent appliances of science. To what we may venture to call the aggressive cleanliness of a well-managed English institution, they add, like their French sisters, a subtle sense of exceeding refinement and taste, which, confined within the narrow limits of strict simplicity, yet breaks out in the dainty white curtains of the babies' cots, in the beautifully goffered pillow shams of a big dormitory, in the cut and make of the little girls' pinafores. For themselves rigid poverty and the barest necessities of life, but for others, their patients, their pupils, and above all their foundling babies, they contribute from the fulness of their charity something more than duty and strict utility demand, and it is precisely this something more, so palpable yet so indefinable, which gives the crown to their labours.

Their foundress, Madame d'Youville, saintly as she was, was yet less noteworthy for her sanctity than for her remarkable administrative abilities. She was a woman born to rule and organize, and it is no fancy to assume that the impress of her genius survives in her Congregation to this day. Throughout the first half of the eighteenth century the general hospital of Montreal had been in a decadent condition, the subject of a ceaseless correspondence between the Governor, the ecclesiastical authorities, and the Ministers of the Kings of France, whose blunder lay in their determination to administer New France from Paris. At length, encumbered with debt and the very walls falling into ruins, the institution drifted into the keeping of two incompetent hospitaliers who professed to nurse no more than four unhappy inmates. For years red tape and

stupidity intervened to prevent Madame d'Youville and her little half-formed community from taking this burden of debt and decrepitude onto their own shoulders. When at length they were installed, and letters patent, dated 1753, were conferred on the community by the French Crown, the change effected was almost miraculous. Within a few years the debts were paid, the buildings restored and enlarged, accommodation for a hundred patients organized; in a word, a hive of pious industry established where before there reigned mismanagement and decay. Yet nothing was altered in the external circumstances of the hospital, save only that a woman of force and ability and purity of intention stood at its head.

It is curious to read to-day of the many expedients to which Madame d'Youville and her Sisters had recourse in order to provide for their beloved poor. No labour was too rough or too tedious for their indomitable spirit. They stitched uniforms and tents for the French soldiers, and were paid a derisory price by the King's representative, who pocketed the difference; they made garments and ornaments for the traders to exchange for furs with the Indians; they manufactured candles and altar-breads and other requisites for the Canadian churches; they brewed beer and dried tobacco, and even mixed lime and hired out boats. When their own building operations were in progress, the Sisters saved labour by themselves carrying the stones in their aprons and mixing the mortar for the masons. Thanks to these measures, no poor were turned away from the hospital doors, and year by year the charity of the foundress took on a wider scope. When small-pox raged in the city, the wards were thrown open to the sufferers; lepers were not refused; rooms were set aside for lunatics, others for fallen women, others again for wounded English soldiers. More than once during the wars that preceded the conquest of Canada, escaped English prisoners found sanctuary in the hospital cellars, and more than one Englishman was ransomed from the Indians by Madame d'Youville's generosity. Probably it was the knowledge of these good deeds on behalf of a hereditary foe which caused the English authorities from the first date of their occupation to look with friendly eyes on this French-speaking community.

But the work which lay nearest the heart of Madame d'Youville, the work which ever since has been most intimately associated with her foundation, was that of rescuing deserted children. In the fulness of her charity she volunteered to



receive not only orphans, but fatherless babes whose mothers could not or would not be burdened with their support. She took this step, knowing the sufferings to which these unhappy children were subjected, and the sins to which in their despair their mothers were often driven. She was determined that, as far as it lay in her power, suicide and infanticide should be stamped out in the colony, and she was untroubled by any of those subtler considerations that vex the soul of the modern philanthropist, as to whether in providing so facile a method of disposing of the outcome of sin, she was not helping to break down the barriers that restrain from sin. Whether this is so or not—and for my part I am more inclined to agree with Madame d'Youville than with her more cautious critics—the foundling hospital initiated by her has been continued by her daughters to this day, and thousands of nameless babies have passed through the vast nurseries of the mother-house in Guy Street. It is true that some restrictions on admission have been found necessary of late years, for children were brought to the Sisters from all parts of the States and even from Europe. That no destitute child is refused, however, I gathered from the fact that on the very day of my first visit a one-day old baby had been picked up on the hospital door-step, while a few days previously another had been brought by an undertaker's man, having been found still breathing in the little coffin to which it had been prematurely consigned.

The so-called "crèche" of the Grey Sisters has come to be one of the sights of Montreal, and every afternoon, from two to four, the doors are thrown open to visitors, and the four hundred orphans and foundlings are more or less "on show." The day of my first visit had been the day of a religious profession, and in honour of this event, every fat, rosy-cheeked child was employed in sucking with immense gusto a long stick of pink barley-sugar, which he or she would politely offer to every visitor in turn. But delightful as the sight was, and free and unself-conscious as the children were, it is not on show occasions that one can judge of an institution, and I persuaded the authorities to allow me a morning visit, which was really far more instructive. I can only say that neither in Europe nor in America have I seen any orphanage to compare with that of the Grey Sisters at Montreal, whether as regards the size and convenience of the buildings, or the excellence of the internal arrangements, or the happiness of the children. The school



forms but one great wing of the mother-house, each of its four floors being dedicated to a separate division—two to boys, one to girls, and one to infants—and each containing play-rooms, class-rooms, dormitories, bath-rooms, and dining-hall. Think of some eighty babies in two vast, airy nurseries, the tiny ones in their old-fashioned French wooden cots, the elder seated in little rocking-chairs or playing on the parquet floor. And every baby a picture of cleanliness, in the whitest of frocks and pinafores, and peace and quiet reigning over all. It is indeed a triumph of good management, for think what eighty mismanaged babies would mean! Inevitably, from the circumstances of their birth, many are delicate, many doomed to an early grave; but what the care of the Sisters can effect is to be seen on the lower floor where the boys of the Kindergarten class—aged from four to seven—reside. Never did I see a jollier, healthier throng of close-cropped, bare-legged youngsters—for neither shoes nor stockings are worn indoors during the hot months—clad in knickerbockers and blue shirts, who flung themselves upon their visitors in the exuberance of their spirits, and poured out questions in a volley of childish French. And the elder boys and girls were equally healthy and prepossessing.

What struck me in Guy Street, and indeed in all the schools I visited in Canada, was a greater freedom than in similar institutions at home. The depressing institution atmosphere with which we are all painfully familiar in England appears not as yet to have crossed the Atlantic. Here in Europe school-masters are the slaves of order and routine and method; uniformity becomes a fetish, until we mistake the means for the end. Now through Canadian schools there still blows the fresh invigorating air of the prairie; the children are bubbling over with vitality, and are under exceedingly little supervision. On my morning visit I saw the elder boys, *i.e.*, those from eight to twelve, over one hundred in number, in vigorous play in the big playground and not a Sister in sight. Later I watched those same sturdy youngsters at dinner, two Sisters serving out the food from behind a counter, and the boys pattered backwards and forwards on their bare feet, carrying their plates to be re-filled, and pinching each other as they went to and fro, full of jokes and laughter. It was no part of the school discipline to teach them to sit like mutes at a funeral, as so many English children are made to do, and yet in all essentials their obedience and docility were beyond praise. The boys do a great deal

of military drill, and have regular little uniforms for the purpose, and the Sisters find that it has excellent results in promoting smartness and obedience. It is scarcely surprising that Canadian farmers in want of boys give the preference to children brought up in Canadian schools over the immigrated British boy, who, as a rule, is found to be sadly wanting in push and grit, besides being wholly ignorant of the conditions of colonial farm life.

It is an exquisite trait in the nuns' treatment of their foundling children that when, as they grow older, they realize that, unlike their happier companions, they are never sent for to the parlour to be made much of by friends or relations and laden with toys and sweets, the nuns arrange for visits of imaginary friends, or themselves send surprise presents, as though from relatives, so that no one in the little school world should feel himself slighted or forgotten.

The great house in Guy Street, with its 1,000 inmates, its 100 novices preparing for the religious life, and 900 Sisters in communion with it scattered over the Dominion, is not the only home of the Grey Sisters in Montreal. One of the most attractive of their minor works is the Patronage d'Youville, a large boarding-house for working girls. Here, to the number of seventy-five, sempstresses, milliners' hands and shop-girls of every description, from fifteen to twenty-two years of age, can board and lodge for a sum varying according to their wages, from 7s. to 10s. a week. For this they receive three meals a day, and in many cases a bed-room to themselves, besides light and service, and the use of a large sitting-room, bath-room, &c. Here, too, the charm of the place lay in its really home-like atmosphere and the refinement displayed in all the appointments. We were fortunate in visiting it towards mid-day, and saw the girls trooping in for their hurried mid-day meal. They sat at little tables in twos and fours, and the service, I can vouch for it, was infinitely better performed than in the average Canadian hotel. The day was Friday, and the dinner consisted of excellent thick soup, fish and poached eggs, dessert and coffee. I wondered where London work-girls could be found faring so wholesomely. But the Montreal work-girls earn five dollars a week, where their European sisters earn from two to three; and though living is dearer than here, the level of living for the working classes is certainly higher. Needless to say, the Home is thoroughly popular and always full; the

girls, all Catholics, seemed to us particularly bright and refined, and, according to the Sister Superior, they had but one fault, a tendency to break the rule obliging them to be within doors every evening at 9.30, and but one failing, a love of finery which absorbs all their earnings. The nuns exercise as little as may be of direct authority; they trust to the good effect of a refined home under Catholic auspices, with a chapel in the house, and to the influence of the girls upon each other, and the Superior was able to assure me that the venture, which has been in existence but three years, had proved wholly satisfactory. I was specially interested in hearing this, as more than one attempt has been made in London to work a Catholic Home on similar lines; but as far as I am aware, without any marked success. The chief points in favour of the Patronage d'Youville seemed to be the exceeding excellence of the domestic arrangements and the small number of rules enforced. I should add that the girls' payments cover all working expenses, the house and furniture having been provided by charity. Even so, the Sisters' housekeeping is a triumph of economy and good management.

At almost every town at which we stopped on the long journey to the Rocky Mountains, we came across the *Sœurs Grises* in one capacity or another. At St. Boniface, the Catholic suburb of Winnipeg, where you feel as though you had been suddenly dropped down in some Brittany village, so French and so Catholic are the surroundings, they act in every capacity, nursing the sick in the hospital, teaching the children in the schools, tending a number of old folk and nursing endless babies in the most delightful of nurseries. At Calgary they have a splendid hospital and at Qu'Appelle Lake, twenty-five miles from the railway, they manage one of the largest and best of the many Industrial Schools which the Canadian Government has established for the Indian children, in the rather vain hope of inoculating them with the advantages of civilization. It was amusing to learn that to their other duties the Sisters added that of arranging marriages between their male and female scholars before they return to the Indian Reserve, at the age of sixteen and seventeen. These marriages, which the priest celebrates, so to speak, at the school door, are said to turn out well, the contracting parties realizing the solemnity of the sacrament more fully than would otherwise be the case, and they possess the further advantage of preventing the possibility of a Christian

girl, on her return to the parental tent, being sold to a heathen husband without her consent.

If I have written at length of the Grey Sisters, it is not because other religious communities are not doing splendid work throughout the Dominion, but because, as I have said, the spiritual daughters of Madame d'Youville stand out as of typically Canadian descent. If they are more French than English in customs and training—though to-day they number many Irish and American Sisters in their ranks—it is only an illustration of what to the observant traveller undoubtedly appears as a prevailing characteristic of Canadian life, that differences of religion go hand in hand with differences of race and language. This is so even far beyond the boundaries of the Province of Quebec. St. Boniface is as French as it is Catholic, and even at Calgary, over two thousand miles from Montreal, a city that is regarded as rather markedly English, sermons are preached in the fine church of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate both in English and French, and it is deemed necessary to give out the notices at Mass on Sundays in both languages. There is of course a considerable Irish Catholic element in many parts of the Dominion, and English-born Catholics cannot be wholly unknown, yet these seem hardly powerful enough to modify the general truth that the English element, roughly speaking, is Protestant, and the French uniformly Catholic. I say "Protestant" advisedly, for outside one or two of the large cities of the East, the Anglican Church does not appear to flourish greatly, and the spiritual life of the country is mainly divided between the Catholic Church, on the one hand, and the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, on the other. The latter element will derive continual support from the large influx of Scandinavian colonists, while the former will be fed not only by Irish immigration, but also by the Poles from Galicia, who strangely enough are arriving in such numbers and covering such large tracts of virgin land with their homesteads, that they are fast becoming a social force to reckon with in the country. Thus the religious future of Canada depends not only on the forces now within the country, but very largely on the waves of immigration from other lands, which in their turn are controlled by a variety of industrial and political considerations. Any forecast therefore concerning religious matters within the Dominion would be even more untrustworthy than all such forecasts are apt to be. Certainly the cursory impression

of a somewhat hurried tour gave no cause for despondency in regard to the position of the Catholic Church; and it is difficult to see on what can be built the assertions one occasionally reads concerning the decaying life of the French-speaking population. For my part, I left Canada with a vivid impression of the vitality of the French and Catholic section of the nation. What is remarkable—so remarkable indeed that were it not an accomplished fact, one would be tempted to regard it as an unattainable ideal—is that neither differences of race, nor of creed, nor of language, have in this instance been deep enough to prevent the heterogeneous elements of which Canada is composed from welding into a homogeneous whole, at once loyal to England and intensely proud of its own national life.

VIRGINIA M. CRAWFORD.

### *The Old Flemish Masters at Home.*

---

FEW of our readers are unacquainted with Bruges. When English Catholics were crushed by the penal laws, the Netherlands, Flanders in particular, provided them with safe and peaceful shelters, where our persecuted ancestors could serve God according to the dictates of their conscience. Since then, under happier auspices, the old Belgian cities have continued to attract English tourists, and Bruges, with its silent streets, dreamy canals, and memories of vanished splendour, has a charm all its own, which our countrymen are the first to recognize.

During the three summer months of this year, from June 15th to September 15th, the quiet atmosphere of the Flemish city has been unusually animated. An Art Exhibition of singular interest attracted thousands of visitors to Bruges, none of whom, we venture to assert, regret the impulse that prompted their visit.

As our readers well know, the silent city of to-day was in the fourteenth century an important commercial centre, the Northern Venice, where all the nations of Europe were represented. Traces of these bygone days of splendour still linger in the names attached to certain old streets and houses: the *Casa Negra*, the *Maison des Orientaux*, the *Rue des Espagnols*, tell their own tale. Not only were the inhabitants of Bruges famous for their wealth and industry; they were also keen lovers of art, and in this they were encouraged by their rulers, the Dukes of Burgundy.

These magnificent princes proved themselves at all times the enlightened and generous patrons of art and learning. Under their protection, Hubert and John van Eyck founded the school of painting that a few years later was still further illustrated by Hans Memling. Indeed, Duke Philip the Good not only valued John van Eyck as a painter, he held him in such high esteem as a man, that he sent him to Lisbon to negotiate his marriage with the Infanta Isabella.



These memories of a glorious past were vividly brought before the twentieth century tourist who this summer visited the Exhibition of ancient Flemish pictures in the Government Palace of Bruges. To organize the Exhibition was no easy matter ; it needed much careful study, tact and perseverance on the part of the devoted and patriotic citizens who headed the committee, but their efforts were, in the end, crowned with success, and in response to their pressing appeal, convents, museums, monasteries, and many private collectors consented to lend their treasures.

Among the amateurs who responded most graciously to their demands were a number of Englishmen. The Duke of Devonshire, the Earl of Northbrook, Sir Frederick Cook, Messrs. Colnaghi, Salting, Macquoid, Clarke, Heseltine, and others are the fortunate possessors of exquisite specimens of Flemish art, which found their way back, for the time being, to the city of their birth. To these contributions were added those of several well-known Parisian, Belgian, and German art collectors : Messrs. Porgès, Goldschmidt, Madame Edouard André, Prince Liechtenstein, Baron Oppenheim, the Duke of Anhalt, M. de Somzéé, and many others.

The result was a collection of almost unique interest ; all the pictures having their individual merit and many of them being superb specimens of a school of painting whose excellence was for many years overlooked or ignored. It was impossible to linger before them without recognizing the artistic sense and technical skill of those primitive Flemish painters ; at the head of whom, as is his right, stands John van Eyck, some of whose finest works are now in English hands. His great achievement, the "Adoration of the Lamb," at which he and his elder brother Hubert worked together, did not figure at the Bruges Exhibition, but he was nevertheless well represented by the picture generally called "*La Vierge Glorieuse*," where our Lady and the Divine Infant are seated between two saints. At the Madonna's feet kneels Canon George van der Paele, at whose request the picture was painted and whose face and figure are marvellously rendered. The Canon's broad, wrinkled, lined face, his characteristic mouth, his thick hands that hold his spectacles and his missal with some difficulty, are painted with extraordinary truth and vigour. We seem to see the old man before us, in the life-like reality of his stolid, heavy, but robust old age.

Van Eyck's triumph is in the precision, truth, and finish of

every detail, in the marvellous blending of his colours, at once soft and brilliant, in his subtle effects of light and shade, rather than in any attempt at seeking an ideal form of beauty. Even in this picture, one of his best, the Madonna is far from lovely, and her Babe, with its wizened little face, is unattractive rather than otherwise. Another example of the painter's careful attention to detail may be found in the portrait of his wife, a somewhat hard-featured, unprepossessing dame, whose face, framed in its white linen hood, is a wonderful specimen of conscientious work. Close to this portrait we noticed a remarkable picture by Hubert van Eyck, the elder of the two brothers, who died in 1426. It belongs to Sir Frederick Cook and represents the three Maries at the Sepulchre, around which are the sleeping soldiers. The nobility of the women's faces and figures, their expression of strained anxiety, contrast with the coarse and vulgar sleepers; in the background the morning light is rising behind Jerusalem. As a rule, the early Flemish masters cared little for nature; they regarded landscapes merely as a necessary background for the human figures upon which their attention was centred; nevertheless, there is often in their treatment of nature a poetical sentiment that makes their skies, trees, and rivers irresistibly charming.

Petrus Christus, John van Eyck's disciple, was nobly represented at the Bruges Exhibition: a small painting belonging to the Duke of Anhalt is a marvel of delicacy; the portrait of a young man, with a dark, intelligent face, presents a specimen of the scarlet shade, at once mellow and brilliant, in which Petrus Christus loved to clothe his figures. St. Eloi, in a neighbouring picture, has a tunic of the same glorious hue.

We wander on, glancing as we pass at the works of Hugo van der Goës, Roger de la Pasture, the "Master of Flemalle," and other known or unknown artists, in whom the characteristics of Van Eyck may be recognized, modified by each painter's individual tendencies. At last we reach what, in the eyes of many, are the pearls of the Exhibition: the pictures of Hans Memling.

They almost fill a room, and a happy and restful hour may be spent in their company.

Here again we have the technical qualities of Van Eyck: his precision, brilliancy, and clearness of touch, but invested with a poetical charm that is Memling's own. His virgins and angels have a softness and purity that brings a breath of



Heaven into our troubled and feverish lives. There is a dignity and innocence about his saints, a steadfast earnestness in the eyes of his kneeling devotees, that can only have been expressed by one who was himself a devout believer.

The famous "Shrine of St. Ursula," one of the best-known of Memling's works, is here, of course, as well as the other pictures painted by him for the "Hospice St. Jean" five hundred years ago, and which, until last June, had never left the ancient hospital.

Then there is a marvellously beautiful triptych, belonging to the Duke of Devonshire, and which, curiously enough, was painted in 1468 for an English knight.

The subject is one that the artists of the day loved best to treat. Our Lady, with her Infant on her knees, is sitting between two kneeling figures. The Babe turns towards an angel, whose face has the laughing expression that Memling sometimes gives his boy angels. The kneeling worshippers are Sir John Donne of Kidwelly and his wife, Elizabeth Hastings. The good knight was killed at the Battle of Edgecote in 1469; his picture may have been painted the previous year, when a number of English noblemen came over to Bruges to be present at the marriage of Charles the Bold with Margaret of York, sister to Edward IV. On either side are St. Barbara, evidently a favourite with the Flemish artists, and St. Catherine. On the panels St. John the Baptist and his namesake the Evangelist, the latter a singularly noble figure, in which the charm of youth and the dignity of apostleship are happily blended. In the background is a landscape of exquisite beauty: a river, a water-mill, a green field, bathed in light.

Another delightful triptych, painted towards 1479, belongs to the Hospital St. Jean and represents the Adoration of the Magi. Here, also, we have the expression of earnestness, devotion, and purity that Memling gives his saints; the kneeling King of the central panel and a pathetic Veronica on the outside, are among his finest creations. Very suggestive too is the fifteenth century frame in which the triptych has remained untouched since the distant days when Bruges was the "Venice of the North" and Master Hans Memling the glory of his adopted city.

There is, as we have said, a restful charm about Memling's pictures; evidently the fifteenth century painters and even

their models, the earnest looking devotees, lived slower than we do. Theirs were stirring times no doubt, times of war and strife, of grand undertakings, heroic virtues and heinous crimes, but their daily life was probably simpler and less feverish. A certain Barbara von Vlaenderberch, whose face appears more than once in the collection, is a charming specimen of a Flemish matron, not strictly speaking pretty, but fair, serene, with pure, steady eyes.

In one of her portraits, she is evidently a young woman; around the unbecoming "hennin," or high pointed head-gear of the time, floats a transparent veil, and the features softened by the filmy texture are charming. In another larger triptych the same Barbara is kneeling, with her eleven daughters behind her; on the other side is her spouse, Guillaume Moreel, with five sons, the youngest of whom has a mischievous expression that contrasts with his brothers' gravity. In spite of her sixteen children, the Flemish matron looks scarcely older than in her earlier portrait. Family cares have not lined the calm face or dimmed the clear, earnest eyes. She reminds us, with her clasped hands and steadfast look, of the grave, motionless women whom we have seen kneeling in the churches of Flanders or Germany: women whose piety has not the demonstrativeness of their southern sisters, but whose self-contained earnestness proves them to be of the same race as Memling's heroines.

Gerard David or Gerard of Bruges gives his saints something of the same wistful sweetness, but his skill in grouping his figures, his rich and varied colouring, mark a decided step in advance in the history of Flemish art. Two large pictures, the judgment of Cambyses and the punishment of a guilty judge, are remarkable for the vigour with which the subjects are handled, indeed the horrible reality of the second picture makes it painful to look at, and our eyes rest more willingly on an exquisite painting lent by the Museum of Rouen. The group of saints that here surround our Lady are sweeter, fairer, more lovely and loveable one than another, and much artistic skill is shown in the arrangement of their attitudes and draperies.

After Gerard David, we find the works of Gerard van der Meire, John Gossart, Bernard van Orley, and Thierry Bouts, whose figures have a peculiar vigour of expression.

Many of these pictures, even those representing sacred subjects, afford us a curious insight into the arrangement of

sixteenth century apartments. Thus, Bernard van Orley, in the "Death of our Lady," gives us what is probably an exact copy of the sleeping-chamber of a wealthy *bourgeoise* of the day: with an ample bed, red draperies, carved seats and tables, and even an oratory. Again, in an "Annunciation" by an unknown artist, we have the carefully appointed bed-room of some sixteenth century Flemish maiden: nothing is wanting, the lamp, the carved and decorated furniture, polished jugs, and even the holy picture hanging on the wall.

Quentin Metsys was represented at the Exhibition by several notable works: an "*Ecce Homo*," from Tournai; a sweet-looking "Virgin," lent by Baron Oppenheim; and a splendid portrait, belonging to Prince Liechtenstein. According to the Catalogue, it represents Gardiner, our English Chancellor, and, apart from its historical interest, it is a grand work, of untold value. The dark, intelligent face, full of energy and spirit, is absolutely alive; the tunic of a soft shade of blue, and the pale, hazy landscape, are exquisite bits of painting.

In the same department are several small pictures by Jerome Patenier, the first of the early Flemish masters who painted nature for her own sake, not merely as a useful background for his figures. He was a native of the Meuse Valley, and the picturesque surroundings among which he grew up probably developed his love of nature.

Several portraits by Mabuse are interesting: the princes and princesses of the House of Hapsburg being easy to recognize at a glance, by their well-defined "Austrian lip." Pourbus, the last of the ancient Flemish artists, is represented by a series of powerful portraits: the dark, energetic faces, framed in velvet and fur, remind us of the days when the citizens of Bruges were the merchant princes of the north.

Although the Exhibition of Old Pictures had the first claim upon the attention of the visitor, the collection of Church plate, vestments, missals, and laces, exhibited at the Hôtel Gruuthuuse, well deserved a lengthy inspection.

The Hôtel itself has an interesting history; it is situated in the neighbourhood of the Church of St. Sauveur, not far from the Quai Vert, one of the most poetical, tranquil, and dreamy corners of old Bruges.

It belonged in ancient times to the Lords of Gruuthuuse, who, like their Sovereigns, the Dukes of Burgundy, were generous patrons of art and literature.

In 1471, Edward IV. of England, then an exile, was royally treated by Louis de Gruuthuuse, upon whom, on his return to England, he bestowed the title of Earl of Winchester. Within the last few years the Hôtel has been bought by the city of Bruges, and during the Exhibition, works of art, such as its former owners would have loved and valued, were, most appropriately, collected within its precincts.

A large number of these, chalices, ciboriums, crosses, and reliquaries, delicately wrought in gold and silver and enriched with precious stones, are the work of a certain monk, Brother Hugo d'Oignies who, judging from the specimens that are left of his skill, must have been a wonderful artist.

We seem to see him in the quiet atmosphere of his monastery, working slowly, silently, thoroughly, as was the custom of these cloistered artists. Unhampered by material cares and claims, caring nothing for glory or for wealth, they laboured for God, to whom their lives were consecrated, and for their art, which they loved for its own sake, with a love free from interested or unworthy motives.

Other memories are awakened by an ivory and amber rosary, lent by the English Augustinian nuns, whose convent in the Rue des Carmes is so well known to the English Catholics who visit Bruges. It once belonged to the neglected Queen of Charles II., Catherine of Braganza, and was given to the community by Lady Lucy Herbert of Powis, who, under the name of Sister Teresa Joseph, became its Superioress, and died in 1744. Her mother had been attached to the household of James II., and it was thus that this pathetic memento of one of our most unhappy Queen Consorts came into the hands of the English Religious.

We may imagine how often in the splendid loneliness of her royal palace Catherine's tears must have fallen fast on the ivory beads, when around her those whom she most loved and trusted were ruthlessly butchered for the faith on the Tyburn gibbet.

Charles II. is also represented at the Exhibition. During his exile in the Low Countries, after his father's death, he made some stay at Bruges and became a member of the Guild of Archers; his signature figures in the *livre d'or* of the guild, to which at his death he left a considerable sum of money.

Among the fine specimens of Church embroidery and ancient vestments shown in an adjoining room was a cope of red silk, trimmed with gold braid, very plain in its shape; according

to tradition it was worn by St. Thomas à Beckett; it now belongs to the Cathedral of Tournai.

Above on the first storey were the illuminated missals with the exquisite miniatures, their colours undimmed by the lapse of centuries, over which many a monastic painter spent a lifetime of patient labour.

Next door was the lace; a profusion of fairy-like fabrics of priceless value, fit to adorn a queen. Some pieces possess an historical interest in addition to their intrinsic beauty; thus the collar of Charles V., the apron of his mother, ill-fated Juana, a collar and cuffs that belonged to Margaret of Austria, the able ruler of the Low Countries.

As we wander among these relics of the past the hours fly unperceived and evening steals upon us unawares. When, on leaving the Exhibition, we find ourselves in the quiet streets, we are struck by the harmony that exists between the memories of bygone times among which we have moved *within*, and the old-world atmosphere which we find *without*. There is no rude awakening, no feeling that the past and the present clash with one another. In many respects the Bruges that Memling knew and loved is still there. As we stroll along we see here a gabled house, there a piece of blue-grey sky reflected in the still water, backgrounds against which the old masters painted their sweet young saints. In the shadowy chapels of Nôtre Dame black-cloaked women with clasped hands and earnest eyes have Barbara van Vlaenderberch's expression of serene, undisturbed faith.

Something in the atmosphere, quiet and restful, makes us feel that here, in spite of the inevitable changes wrought by time, the link between the past and the present is still unbroken, and in our feverish twentieth century this feeling is as welcome as it is rare.

BARBARA DE COURSON.

## *Boy-Savers.*

---

### I.

IT is possible that there may be some among the readers of THE MONTH who will turn aside from this heading with a feeling of impatience. They will say, with truth, that the loss of Catholic children to the Catholic Faith is nothing new; that they have heard all about it many times before, notably in these very pages: they will admit that the matter is sad and serious, and calls for renewed and persistent effort: but they do not see that they themselves can do anything—it is not in their line—and these constant incentives to take up rescue work become wearisome, and seem to lead to no result. Moreover, things are much what we should expect: “the poor in a lump is bad,” and they will always be with us as they always have been; and after all things are not worse than they were, although folk talk more about them. Only the other day there was a paragraph in the papers about “those daring ruffians who go about the streets in gangs, knocking down and robbing every person they meet;” and this was quoted from the *Times* of a century ago; even the modern “hooligans” do not go so far as this. And so on.

Well, perhaps there may be something in this way of looking at things. It may be that in the anxiety to obtain additional workers and to gain attention for the claims of those urgently in need of help, writers have taken insufficient account of the efforts already made, being themselves convinced of the inadequacy of such efforts to the needs of the situation. So it may be worth while to give some account of what is being done under very different circumstances and in widely separated regions, to solve what is admittedly one of the most difficult problems of the present day.

But at the outset we are met with the question—To whom should helpers more specially address themselves? What work is needed most—preventive or reclamatory? Are we to aim at keeping those over whom we already have some control



or at winning back those who have strayed from their bearings? Is our work to be for the benefit of the good or the bad—the confraternity-boy or the hooligan?

To this the answer is simple—we want workers in all these directions—*lay* workers, be it understood, for the clergy have already more than they can do. And we want money—not *much* money, but *some*. Experience teaches more and more plainly that it is personal service rather than money that we need; the latter without the former may be worse than useless. One centre of work, carried on by two zealous laymen for a term of years, was more effective during its days of penury, than when it became merged into a more ambitious scheme with larger funds, to which, by the way, it was handed over as a going concern with a small balance in hand. Catholics have many calls upon their purses, but if some portion of the amount spent by wealthy and charitable folk in disfiguring our churches with bad art were devoted to the building-up of the living temple, the result would be better in every way. It is anything but satisfactory, for example, that the year's income of the South London Battalion of the Boys' Brigade should be only £227, of which more than half is contributed by one person, and nearly a fifth by two more. But it is personal help that is needed, and only he "who gives himself with his gift" can claim a place in the first rank of workers.

The Boys' Brigade, to which I purpose to return, is perhaps our most successful instance of preventive work, yet it only touches a small section of the subject. But what about the "lapsed masses," as they are called—the hundreds or rather thousands of lads in our big towns who never—or at most "hardly ever"—go to Mass, though they have been brought up in our schools and at any rate taught something of their religion? How far down are we to go to get these? "You must civilize before you can Christianize," said a priest at one of the earlier Catholic Conferences; and the saying startled many and aroused protest. Yet is it not true? When Cardinal Manning heard it objected to the League of the Cross that it sometimes made men sober without inducing them to become religious, he answered, "When a man is sober, I can talk to him, and he will listen; when he is drunk, it is useless to talk to him, for he *cannot* listen." Similarly, while your hooligan is running about the streets in by no means doubtful company, he will not come within reach of your efforts; but when he has

been induced to come within four walls, and finds the restriction attractive, you may at any rate, if you are very tolerant and patient, enter into friendly relations with him—and these may be “stepping-stones to higher things.”

I lately met a lady from Northampton, Mass., who, in conjunction with Mr. G. W. Cable, the well-known American author, had been instrumental in establishing admirable social work in that city. I wish I could put on paper the graphic account she gave of her initial experience. Northampton abounded in religious and educational influences, but a large number of lads were outside either, and these Miss Moffat determined to secure. She took rooms in a part of the town most frequented by the “toughs,” and put in a caretaker, who “smoked and swore, and put his feet on the table.” She provided papers of a kind not patronized by respectable clubs, and left things to simmer for a year, during which time the rooms became popular and populous. Then one night she went down, took up a paper, and began to read, to the consternation and general exit, not without comments, of the *habitués*. After two or three visits, it was pointed out to her that this wasn't a place for a woman to come to; to which she replied, “Well, seeing it's my room, I'm going to stay.” After a while, some of the frequenters resumed their attendance, and conversation became more general, especially as Miss Moffat, among other qualifications, had a considerable knowledge of racehorses, and was able to show one of the spokesmen that he was “a back-number.” Her efforts at conversation were discounted by the remark of a listener—“Well, I wish I'd swallowed a dictionary for breakfast this morning!”—so she adopted a simpler style. Finding that prize-fighting and boxing were popular subjects, she requested to be instructed in the terms employed in the noble art of self-defence. Later, she remarked that this was “poor stuff, anyway; a good goat would knock it out of the best of 'em;” and some local commemoration of the War of Independence afforded an opportunity for interesting the lads in that subject. This was the beginning of a changed state of affairs; one thing led to another; fresh centres were started; classes were formed at the request of the members; and now Northampton has some sixteen “Home Culture Clubs”—the name seems the worst thing about them—with an aggregate of about five hundred members. It is pleasant to know that the Catholic clergy of Northampton warmly support the work, and recommend the clubs to the lads of their flocks.



Here, of course, the work is not definitely religious, although in its results it makes for righteousness. Among ourselves, I am inclined to think that, if we want to secure the lower strata of Catholic lads, we must be content for a long time with very little in the way of religious observance, and, indeed, be very chary of suggesting, and still more so of endeavouring to enforce it. I know this will be looked upon as shocking by those who have no practical or personal acquaintance with the condition of our street lads, but it is true for all that, and it is just as well that folk who may be drawn to the work of boy-saving should know what—or what *not*—to expect.

Having arrived at this point, I will select, as my first illustration of what is being done, the very remarkable work set on foot and conducted by the Rev. George E. Quin, S.J., of New York, which forms the subject of two admirable pamphlets from his pen, the first instalments of what he calls "The Boy-Savers' Series."<sup>1</sup> Every one interested in work among lads should obtain a copy of these admirable little books, and lay to heart the instructions and suggestions which they contain. So far as I know, we have nothing in Catholic literature so informing, so full of practical suggestions, so wide in sympathy, as these books, the first of which, as soon as it appeared, was recommended by Cardinal Vaughan to his clergy assembled in synod; it is embellished with a frontispiece representing "The Author's 400 Credentials," *i.e.*, the four hundred members of the Sodality of St. Aloysius, St. Joseph's Church, Troy, N.Y.

In this booklet Father Quin defines the kind of boy whom he wants to reach, the help that he needs, and the helper whom he desiderates. He rightly points out that the work, even when organized by a priest, may well be carried out by laymen; and he disposes of certain popular fallacies, *e.g.*, that only those endowed with a special personal magnetism can attract boys, and that only those who can ensure the permanence of the work should undertake it. This last objection he considers the weakest of all:

It assumes that nothing is gained by a short-lived though sturdy boys' society. Is it then no blessing if, even during a few months, a lot of young fellows are held to renewed love of religion, sacraments, and morality? Early advancement in piety should not be likened to a

<sup>1</sup> The Boy-Savers' Series. Booklet the First: *Organizers and their First Steps*. Booklet the Second: *Natural Attractions*. By the Rev. George E. Quin, S.J. Messenger Library, 27, West 16th Street, New York City. Price 25 cents each.

business trip, profitless till a certain distance is travelled, but to a health tour, in which every mile counts.

This, of course, does not mean that Father Quin undervalues the importance of persevering and continuous effort, but he wishes to show those who may not be able to ensure such permanence that they need not on that account hold back from giving temporary help. The same encouraging view may fairly be taken with regard to boys who, after a short time, drop away from the society; it may happen that their temporary connection with it has given them a taste for better things, and that its influence will remain after they have withdrawn from active membership.

As to the magnetic influence, Father Quin admits that for young men of eighteen and above, such a power in a leader is desirable and even essential; but he is prepared "to show that the organizer of juniors is not, like the unapproachable poet, 'born;' but that, in common with surgeons, bankers, merchants, and the like, he is 'made' by careful development and well-directed application of ordinarily high ability." He proceeds to name the three essentials without which no "boy-saver" is properly equipped—intelligent zeal, a turn for practical expedients, and some disciplinary skill; "this triple gauntlet really covers all of the essentials for boy-saving work." Under the second head, Father Quin urges the necessity, too often overlooked in practice, though always recognized in theory, of adapting the work in every possible way to boyish tastes. What he would think of the "pious elderly man," who is, I believe, still recommended by the Society of St. Vincent de Paul as a controller of "patronage" work, or indeed what he would say as to the word "patronage," I hardly dare conjecture.

Education of any description is at its best when teachers can get down to the level of their followers before beginning to climb. On this principle the kindergarten has opened up an immense field in which children are trained without departing from childish ways. However, so little of the kind is done for organized cadets, that too often their society, with its weak attractions, excessive and dry religious proceedings, multiplied obligations, and scant protective regulations, seems planned rather for old people with only one leg out of the grave, than for striplings to be won only by close attention to their fun-loving, fickle, and mischievous turn of mind.

Another noteworthy test which Father Quin applies to the work is the readiness with which the boys themselves take it up. The fraternity, he says, "should be so permeated with the gospel of 'a good time'" that its very duties should be almost popular. The boys must themselves gather in other boys; there is to be no hunting-up new members; and he has recourse to italics in order to emphasize his objection to the practice of appeals from the altar to parents to "see that their sons are present." By a readily intelligible paradox, Father Quin would bring boys in by keeping them out; he has a "waiting list" on which those who have passed the three-fold test—First Communion made, the required stature attained, and a guarantee of twenty-five cents entrance money—are placed. "It is when crowded out of anything that boys and others are chiefly impressed with the importance of getting in;" and when the society is announced to be "chock-full," the anxiety to be admitted becomes intense. Who does not remember Tom Sawyer's successful expedient, whereby he not only got his task of whitewashing a fence taken off his hands, but even obtained various desirable emoluments for the privilege of sharing in the work? I think that, as a rule, workers give the boys a notion that they (the lads) are conferring a favour instead of receiving one—I am conscious of having more than once failed in this way myself;—but it is obvious that if they have to assume a waiting attitude the result will be widely different.

The plan of admission by height seems a daring, as it is a novel, expedient, which Father Quin admits sometimes presses a little hardly on boys who are otherwise well qualified for admission. An amusing account is given of the various ways by which lads endeavour to add a cubit, or its equivalent, to their stature. Any one who knows the objection boys have to admitting "kids" into their gatherings will sympathize with Father Quin's test, even if they do not employ it. In the most successful club I ever had, the lowest age of admission was fixed at fourteen; but as the members increased in years their notions of the age required grew in proportion, and it was with the greatest difficulty—indeed, only by creating a class of junior members—that I could obtain the election of youthful aspirants, and that only by limiting their privileges. The poor juniors would have sold their birthrights and anything else in order to get in, and implored me to make any sacrifice on their behalf to secure the desired boon. So I drew up a

code and read it to the club, who listened with unwonted attention. When I read: "Junior members shall only have the privilege of voting at elections for their own grade," somebody promptly said, "I propose an amendment to that—I propose they don't have no votes at all;" and the proposition was seconded, and carried by acclamation, before the bewildered chairman knew exactly what was happening. "No matter how much organized," says Father Quin, "adolescent mortals still refuse even a smile of brotherly recognition to those who have been laughing in this vale of tears some sixty moons less than themselves."

Father Quin has no hesitation as to the advisability of enrolling juvenile "toughs"—the American analogue of "hooligans"—into the society, at any rate when a priest is at the head of it, and expresses himself with his usual frankness and unconventionality. "A dirty face, or very ragged clothes, drunken parents, an irreligious home, and to be reputed a good hand at swearing," are recommendations rather than drawbacks in the boy who desires to join, and he continues:

I proffer the advice to study closely, before anathematizing, profane, free-fisted, police-baiting youngsters under fifteen. In many instances they are promising crude material. Not a few of them are really diamonds, though admittedly the roughest conceivable. Hidden under rags, slang, and boyish mischief, often lie hearts generous, honest, and pure. . . . The very boisterousness and boldness of the *gamin* carry recommendation. These traits are born of a fearless energy, most precious when guided into channels of Catholic life. . . . Additional reason for a liberal policy follows from the known strength of juvenile solidarity. Be it for weal or woe, boys so "hang together" that the exclusion of many who are bad means loss of many who are good; but a Scriptural passage commends the husbandman who plucked no cockle from his field, lest the wheat be rooted up. Take "gang" loyalty into account, then, and leave no boy out who can possibly be in. A bad boy placed outside the pale always hampers, and often destroys, membership on the part of his chums.

Nor is he less emphatic in his views on the religious question, with which he deals somewhat at length in his second book. He has none of the delusions which sometimes affect pious folk: he says—

The boys' society, even while in point of fact steadily assisting its members to their religion and to the use of the sacraments, makes but feeble approach to the ideal set up for it by well-disposed ordinary

minds. The common run of good people, over-rating the significance of orderly external conduct on the part of the juveniles, imagine that if any spiritual good is being really accomplished in rough, mischievous youngsters, it must necessarily appear in their gentle and more thoughtful deportment. This test is, of course, absurdly false; and the worker who hopes, by creating a large group of small saints, to meet it, is one, the bright green of whose inexperience must quickly turn to the bluest of chagrin. When boys are banded together, there is always [so much] constant disorder on the part of the mischievous ones and enough intermittent mischief on the part of the orderly ones, that the entire contingent, no matter how much really raised heavenwards, will, to most observers, never be elsewhere than under a cloud.

This does not in the least mean that religion is put into the background. "One lad prepared for the sacraments is worth a street full of lads taught calisthenics, modelling, or how to spell;" but "the spiritual machinery of a juvenile fraternity is probably never in better operation than when banked and flanked in temporalities until, to cursory observers, nearly out of sight." "Begin with them at their play and finish with them at the altar," are words with which we may well close the consideration of this point of our subject.

The due and prudent use of gifts and prizes occupies a good many pages of Father Quin's second book. As usual, he takes a line at once liberal and judicious—such methods of attraction are legitimate, even desirable; but "since gift-distributions, more than other celebrations, take an appearance of numbering membership, they should not be overdone." Badges and ribbons are discussed with a fulness and practical consideration which shows that, at any rate in New York, they are important factors in the work; Father Quin discusses the size, colour, and form of these articles with a seriousness equal to that which the Major and Jimmy bestowed upon the United Grand Junction Lirriper and Jackman Great Norfolk Parlour Line. But the point on which he lays special stress is the importance of public display, which in America takes the form especially of "torchlight parades." These, like all the other methods advocated, indirectly advance religion.

The society that timorously nestles at the sanctuary, strikes the average boy-observer as being weak, and, at most, only piously ornamental. To his way of thinking, it lacks energy and power of command. Let the sodality, however, move abroad to don the honours of athletics, military drill, &c., and at once its worldly

position inspires, in the unreflecting juvenile mind, far higher conceptions of inherent spiritual authority. . . . Success is, in a great measure, dependent on the idea entertained by the members of their society's secular standing. Your exhortation, say in favour of frequent Communion or a better attendance at religious meetings, be it, *per se*, ever so much disconnected from worldly things, will strike home all the more forcibly, if delivered immediately after a thronged and rousingly successful public field-day. . . . Boys respect their organization all the more when people talk of its doings.

Whether badges are popular with English and Irish lads seems doubtful; my experience connected with the League of the Cross would show the contrary. But the success of the Boys' Brigade movement is, I think, largely to be attributed to its public parades and demonstrations, its uniform, and military ceremonies.

The final chapter of the second booklet deals with the financial question; and here Father Quin makes an earnest appeal for that outside help without which no efforts at boy-saving can be carried on. He is thoroughly sound in maintaining that the boys themselves should pay their quota, having accepted the truth, familiar to all workers, that boys, like other folks, do not greatly value what they do not pay for; but he insists that "the properly conducted boys' fraternity will ever be one that charity must, to some extent, befriend."

Whenever God's own towers, whether in the material or moral order, are to be built, their erection, for the benefit of the world, presupposes, as a rule, some of the world's money-leverage. And this is unreservedly true of flourishing juvenile church-organizations. It is utter blindness to suppose that the common run of youngsters are prepared, like many of their elders, to unite inexpensively for the sole purpose of holding meetings characterized by nothing more costly than prayers. Without attractions, you cannot have the boys; without cost, you cannot have attractions that suffice to gain the boys.

I would gladly make more extracts from Father Quin's excellent manuals, but I have already devoted to them more than their share of the space allotted to me. It will have been noticed that nothing has been said about the work of indoor clubs. Father Quin's third booklet, which it is to be hoped will not be long delayed, is to deal with these and other forms of indoor amusement. The words in which he refers to the forthcoming publication at the conclusion of his second booklet,

may fitly end this paper, to which indeed, in its measure, they apply :

It is fated to be wholly misunderstood by persons unmindful of the high purpose in view, and of the necessary lowliness of ways and means without which that purpose cannot be gained. Every builder must begin by laying rough foundations, and these, if thoughtlessly considered all alone, can easily seem to belie the quality of a religious structure that they are going to support. And so, understanding the peril of his situation, the craftsman now at work protests that what he has done, and what he is next to do, are not for the miscellaneous throng, but for the comparatively few who realize that boy-saving endeavour is something sacred, and that, *unless boys be first unreservedly taken as boys, it rarely saves.*

JAMES BRITTEN.



## *The Suppression of the Society of Jesus.*

---

### IX.—THE HARASSING OF CLEMENT XIII. (2).

THE last article brought the history of the negotiations between the five Courts on the Jesuit question up to the date of November 30, 1767, that is to say, nine months after the Spanish expulsion. We have seen how they resolved among themselves to work for a Papal Suppression, and how the means on which they relied for getting Clement XIII. to fulfil their desire was not the force of any proofs of Jesuit misconduct they were prepared to lay before him, but the force of their threats to deprive him of his territory, and as the last resort even to withdraw their subjects from his communion. We have now to continue this scandalous history.

On December 3rd, 1767, Cardinal Torregiani wrote to Mgr. Luciani,<sup>1</sup> who had succeeded Mgr. Pallavicini as Nuncio at Madrid, directing him to protest on the part of the Holy Father against the sudden deportation of the Sicilian Jesuits into his territory, which had been carried out without any previous intimation, and which he called "speculating on the Holy Father's humanity." Luciani wrote back on December 22nd. He had had an audience with Grimaldi, who told him that the Court of Naples had "for a long time back" been resolved that they would tolerate the Jesuits in their midst no longer. Grimaldi then added this important statement, which forms another decisive proof that their intention was not to invoke the Pope's judgment, but to coerce his action. "Monsignore," he said, "the fire is now lighted; the Catholic Courts have made the Suppression of the Society their *mot d'ordre*, and if the Holy Father does not accede to this, tell your Court that further steps will be taken, and that the loss of several of the Pontifical possessions is inevitable. But if His Holiness consents to satisfy the Catholic Courts by suppressing the Society, he will recover what he has already lost and will avert

<sup>1</sup> Theiner, op. cit. i. p. 107.



new disasters. Otherwise I fear lest what the Courts now use as a means will in future be enforced as a principle." Luciani further tells us that, either on this same or another occasion, the Portuguese Minister at Madrid assured him that "his King was ready to restore relations with the Holy See to their former state"—that is to say, to put a stop to the schism in which the King of Portugal had then involved his country—"if the Pope would only consent to suppress the Society." The assurance was given in Grimaldi's presence, who remarked that "it was a strange thing for the Pope to sacrifice to his blind predilection for these Religious the sacred interests of religion in such a country as Portugal."

On January 26, 1768, Luciani<sup>1</sup> in another despatch mentions the discovery of two ancient consultations on the lawfulness of a Catholic prince making war on the Pope, one being by Melchior Cano, the other by a Jesuit Father attached to the Imperial College at Madrid, who had been consulted on the subject by Louis XIV. of France, then engaged in a quarrel with Innocent XI.<sup>2</sup> The Minister caused the text of these two consultations to be published, to which Luciani referring says: "Your Eminence will see what is aimed at by the publication of such writings." It should be observed, moreover, that Luciani's letter is dated two days before the publication of Clement XIII's *Monitorium* against the Duke of Parma. Theiner's reflections on this order of dates is very just and deserves to be quoted.<sup>3</sup>

These facts prove sufficiently that the King of Spain had for some time past entertained the idea of compelling the Pope to a total extinction of the Society, and of threatening him that, in case he did not comply, he would take from him the States of Benevento and Corvo, and of Castro and Ronciglione, besides urging the King of France to do the same with Avignon and the Comtat de Venaissin. The affair of Parma [that is, of the *Monitorium*] appeared to the Courts to have occurred the more opportunely as it supplied them with a pretext for carrying out the usurpation with some semblance of right, namely, of a pretension to avenge the outrage offered to their relative. . . . But neither Spain nor Naples, and much less France, ever thought seriously of occupying those States solely because of the Parma affair.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 121.

<sup>2</sup> We have not been able to discover the name of this Jesuit Father, but Luciani felt sure that much surprise would be caused at Rome by the knowledge that any member of the Society should have perpetrated such a work.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

They wished to have in their hands a pledge, the restoration of which would be the price for the Suppression of the Society of Jesus. The outcome of the affair furnishes incontestable evidence of this; for the revocation of the decree against Parma which the Sovereigns demanded, was in fact nothing more than a pretext for wresting from the Pope the desired Suppression, since it was well understood that he would never consent to that other humiliating concession.

We can now come to the *Consulta* of March 21st, 1768, which, it will be remembered,<sup>1</sup> had to report on the draft of Grimaldi's plan for extorting the Suppression from the Pope. The King had directed that the five episcopal members of the Extraordinary Council—namely, the Archbishops and Bishops of Saragossa, Burgos, Orihuela, Albarracin, and Taragona—should in this instance be specially consulted. We can trace their clerical influence in the resulting *Consulta*, and gather from it that they were, as might have been expected, all good Regalists. The Council, whilst acknowledging Grimaldi's draft to be "firm, solid, and clear" in its language, thought it desirable that the *Supplica* to the Pope "should be conceived in terms which, far from awakening mistrust in the Curia, or indignation at an attack made on their cherished doctrines and interests, would depict the body they were asked to dissolve in the colours of a true enemy to the Apostolic See." This was certainly a prudent suggestion. Though the Pope was to be made the victim of coercion, it was clearly desirable that he should be enabled to keep up appearances, the more so as the Suppression could only be effected by a Bull or Brief, in which it would be necessary to incorporate some statement of reasons for so stringent a measure.

What they suggest is that the *Supplica* should "cite the history of Pius IV., Clement VIII., Paul V., Alexander VII., Innocent XI., Clement XI., Benedict XIII., Innocent XIII., Benedict XIV.; and further allege in proof the obstinacy of the Society in resisting the Pontifical Constitutions regarding missions in the East, and the scandal occasioned to Christianity by the consequent loss of missions; the war of heretics against the See of Peter precisely because of its toleration of men who had laboured constantly to destroy Christianity down to its roots by means of idolatrous rites and cults; and finally, the insuperable difficulty opposed to the return of the Protestants to the bosom of the Church, as long as they were treated

<sup>1</sup> See THE MONTH for September, p. 273.

to the spectacle of the Holy See seeming, by its protection of the Jesuits, to regard with favour their anti-monarchical and seditious system.

This ecclesiastically-leavened *Consulta* made also another suggestion which does credit to their discernment, if not honour to their sense of equity. They recommend that the Pope should at once be called upon, not only to suppress the Society, but to do it by way of an administrative act, without entering on any formal discussion, or invoking the aid of any consultative Congregation. And they urge that this demand should be accompanied by a threat that in case of non-compliance "Spain would feel compelled to suppress the Tribunal of the Nunciature, and stop all recourse to Rome on the part of its subjects, save in those matters which were explicitly reserved to the Holy See by the ancient discipline of the Church, the Bishops thus regaining their original and native authority according to that ancient discipline."

<sup>1</sup> We see sufficiently from the foregoing facts what were the plans recommended for coercing Clement XIII. In the sequel we shall find that in their substantials they were adhered to by the allied Courts, although in some particulars they were set aside. We must, however, pass very summarily over the remaining history, so far as it lay within the reign of Clement XIII.

On April 16th, as has been told already, the Joint Note of France, Spain, and Naples, in reference to the affairs of Parma, was delivered to the Pope by d'Aubeterre. It threatened reprisals in the event of the Pope refusing to revoke his *Monitorium*, and to make reparation to the outraged Duke. As Clement refused, Avignon and the Comtat de Venaissin were occupied on June 11th, and Benevento and Corvo on June 12th. On June 15th,<sup>1</sup> in an audience in which Clement XIII. complained of the occupation of Benevento, the news of which had just arrived, d'Aubeterre asked for the supersession of Torregiani by another Cardinal, with whom the Powers could better negotiate. Clement, after some protests against the impropriety of such a proposal, asked him whom he desired to see appointed. D'Aubeterre then asked for Clement's major-domo, a man whom he had described in a letter, dated April 27, 1768,<sup>2</sup> as the one anti-Jesuit member of the Papal household. This was preposterous, as the major-domo was not even a Cardinal, and

<sup>1</sup> Theiner, op. cit. p. 130.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 128.

eventually the Pope appointed Negroni, thereby justifying the anticipations of the Fiscals, for Negroni was not at all the kind of man they wanted.

On August 13th, as the result of another *Consulta* given two days previously by the Extraordinary Council, Carlos III. sent secret instructions to Azpuru<sup>1</sup> to demand five things of the Pope which must be granted at once. They were (1) the withdrawal of the *Monitorium* of January 30th; (2) the recognition of the independent sovereignty of the Duke of Parma; (3) the recognition that the territories recently annexed by France and Naples were to remain incorporated in those two kingdoms respectively; (4) the exile of Torregiani from Rome; (5) the instant suppression of the Society and secularization of all its members, together with the perpetual exile from Rome of its General, Padre Ricci. Only on these conditions, he was to say, could good relations be established between the Holy See and Spain. The King of Spain also induced the King of France to make a similar demand, and Tanucci,<sup>2</sup> on September 28th, sent 4,000 Neapolitan troops to Orbitelli, a port situated a few miles north of Civita Vecchia, that they might be ready to occupy Ronciglione and Castro on the first opportunity. He had even the insolence to lodge a thousand troops in the Villa Madama, King Ferdinand's villa at Rome, which stood right opposite the Castle of Sant' Angelo, and to say that he was thus acting under the orders of Choiseul—a representation which Choiseul, whose refined habits revolted against the coarser methods of his fellow-workers in the South, indignantly repudiated. Carlos III., on the other hand, wrote to Tanucci urging him to carry into effect at once the occupation of the two Duchies.

Let us now turn for a moment to consider the attitude of Clement XIII. in the face of all these endeavours to force his hand. The most resolute foes of his policy have recognized his saintly character. Thus the Abbé Clement, who was sent to Rome about this time by the Jansenists to watch over their interests, tells us that at Padua, before his elevation to the Papacy, "he was called the Saint; and was an exemplary man, who, notwithstanding the immense revenues of his diocese and his private estate, was always without money, owing to the lavishness of his almsdeeds, and would give away even his linen;" and even this hostile writer allows that "he had no other dependence on the Jesuits than that with which he was

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 139.

inspired by his esteem for the regularity of their lives and their zeal for the ministry."<sup>1</sup> He was also, by general acknowledgment, a most lovable man, grave, but exquisitely gentle and winning in his manners. He was not a strong character and perhaps was too prone to lean on others. But his extreme conscientiousness made it impossible for him to be the creature of any man. Moreover, he was inflexibly just and incapable of yielding when a principle was at stake.<sup>2</sup> It was a defect, perhaps, in him that he was so unable to restrain his tears, or the disclosure of the spiritual motives by which he was fortifying himself interiorly, but he was always reasonable, courteous, and conciliatory in his language with the Courts, and invariably took up sound positions. In the matter of the campaign against the Society his position was sound and edifying throughout. When the first notification of the coming Portuguese expulsion reached him, he wrote back to Joseph I., on August 2, 1759,<sup>3</sup> saying that "if among the persons who wear the habit (of the Society) there are some or several who are guilty of some offence or other, it is just that these should be made to suffer a proportionate punishment, and God forbid that we should ever think of protecting the guilty and so authorizing disorders. . . . But we should be false to our conscience if we did not counsel your Majesty to beware of confounding the innocent with the guilty and making the former suffer penalties due only to the latter." We have seen, too, how he spoke in like sense to the King of

<sup>1</sup> *Journal d'un voyage et correspondance en Italie et en Espagne.* Ap. Ravignan, i. p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> It is charged against him that he was dominated by Cardinal Torregiani, his Secretary of State, who in turn was dominated by his Jesuit confessor, Padre Ricci. That he paid much attention to Torregiani's counsels is doubtless true, but he was not open to reproach for that, for Torregiani was himself a man of genuine piety, sincere motives, and good judgment. Even a writer so hostile as Theiner is fain to say of him that "he was a noble-minded, firm, and upright man, energetic and capable of vigorous action and thoughts;" and can only censure him for "regarding the great ecclesiastical questions which then agitated the Christian world, more with the eye of a theologian who discusses them, than with the masterly insight of a statesman who judges, dominates, and directs them"—fine words which, being interpreted, mean that Torregiani regarded such questions too much in the light of conscience, and too little in the light of expediency.

And as for the latter's supposed dependence on Padre Ricci, who was another excellent man, there is no ground for it save the bare fact that Padre Ricci was his confessor, and that, needless to say, did not mean that he undertook to accept Padre Ricci's dictation, even if the latter had been prepared to offer it, in regard to the exercise of his secretarial office. Besides, Torregiani was a far stronger character than the timid and retiring Ricci, and far more capable of dominating him than likely to be dominated by him.

<sup>3</sup> De Ravignan, op. cit. vol. i. p. 77.

Spain, in April, 1767, and have heard from Don M. Roda how he was still holding to the same position in the August of that year.

When the Courts began to press him with their threats he at once realized the situation, but refused to be influenced by such unworthy motives, and kept on till the end with quiet though sorrowful determination, opposing a passive resistance to each fresh attempt to terrorize him and vindicating the cause of right in a succession of dignified protests. Thus on June 14th, 1768, when the news of the occupation of Benevento had just arrived, he said to d'Aubeterre, as the latter states in his despatch of next day,<sup>1</sup> "The last time you came to me with menaces, to-day you come with arms in' your hands. . . . Benevento has been occupied by the Neapolitan troops, but I place these reprisals with the menaces that preceded them, at the foot of the Crucifix. . . . He it is who must judge between us." And on October 27th, through Cardinal Torregiani, in a message acquainting the Nuncios at the various Courts with the five demands made on him in the previous month: "The Holy Father, thanks be to God, although exteriorly so agitated, is not discouraged in his heart; these adversities only confirm him the more and encourage him to suffer the greatest possible reverses for the cause of God and His Church. Violence will never hinder him from speaking out with an Apostolic liberty, and recalling the Kings, his sons, to their duty."

Still, if his soul was strengthened, his body was enfeebled under the stress of the sufferings which "the Kings, his sons," inflicted on him, and the limits of its endurance were well-nigh reached when the tragic year 1768 drew to its close. Nor had the new year fulfilled many of its days when the last crushing blow fell on his head. Louis XV. felt small personal interest in the cruel campaign, and his light-minded Minister, Choiseul, was wearied out by Clement XIII.'s persistent refusals. The French Court had, however, made a rule for itself to follow the lead of the Court of Spain, and Carlos III. with his bull-dog tenacity thought not of withdrawing but of driving his fangs deeper into the heart of the afflicted Pontiff. His new move was another and sterner joint representation from the three Bourbon Courts, whose Ministers by pre-arrangement, in the third week of January, 1769, presented each a *Memoria* demanding the instantaneous suppression of the obnoxious

<sup>1</sup> Theiner, *ibid.* p. 130.



Order. The text of the Spanish *Memoria*—or rather a summary of it—is given by Señor Ferrer del Rio,<sup>1</sup> and runs as follows :

The disorders caused by the Religious of the Society in the Spanish dominions, and their repeated and persistent opposition to every lawful authority deemed to be disaffected towards their interests, have obliged the Catholic King, in the exercise of his God-given power, to chasten and repress their crimes, and to destroy throughout his States so abiding a focus of disturbance. But, if he has thus fulfilled his obligation as Father of his people, much still remains for him to do as a Son of the Church, as its protector, and the protector of religion and sound doctrine. There can now-a-days be no doubt as to the corrupt character of the speculative and moral teaching of these Religious, or of its downright opposition to that of Jesus Christ, nor is there any one who remains unconvinced that the tumults and attempts of which they are accused, are due to the demoralization which their government has undergone since the time when, having lost sight of the aims proposed to them by their saintly Founder, they embraced a political and mundane system adverse to all the authorities established by God on earth; and so became hostile to the persons of Sovereigns, bold in inventing and sustaining murderous opinions, and persecutors of prelates and virtuous men. Nor has the Holy See itself been exempted from their persecutions, calumnies, threats, and insubordination, and the history of many Sovereign Pontiffs yields abundant evidence of what they have had to suffer through the Society's misdeeds, and of what they have to fear should they venture to oppose its ideas of domination, its interests, or its opinions. Its persistency in exciting disorders, and its absolute incorrigibility, are equally proved by many examples which can be drawn from the countries where they still exist, and the impossibility of its ever becoming useful in the future is deducible from the discredit into which it has everywhere fallen, now that the mask of imposture, with which it deceived the world, has been torn from it. As long, too, as the Jesuits exist, there can be no hope of drawing into the Church the dissident princes, who, seeing the disturbances these Religious create in Catholic States, how they insult the sacred persons of Kings, and stir up the people to resist public authority, will keep away from the Church that they may avoid the danger of introducing such calamities into their own kingdoms.

Moved by these reasons which are most notorious; penetrated with a filial love for the Church, and filled with zeal for its exaltation, as well as for the advancement and glory of the legitimate authority of the Holy See, and the tranquillity of Catholic kingdoms; intimately persuaded that public prosperity cannot be secured as long as this institute survives; desiring, finally, to fulfil his duty to religion, to the Holy

<sup>1</sup> *Reinado de Carlos III.* ii. p. 250.



Father, to himself, and to his subjects, the Catholic King begs of His Holiness, with the utmost urgency, that he will entirely and totally dissolve the Society called that of Jesus, and secularize all its members, forbidding them to form any other congregation or community, under any title of reform or new institute, or to be subject to any other superiors save the Bishops of the dioceses where they reside after secularization.

It must not be forgotten that the various *Consultas* and other documents appertaining to the Secret Inquiry into the Jesuit question, some of which are now accessible, and have been used in these articles, were at the time carefully concealed from Pope, Jesuits, and the public generally, all of whom were in absolute ignorance of the mysterious causes of the Spanish expulsion. The true significance, therefore, of this *Memoria* presented to Clement XIII. on January 18th, 1769, is that it was the first and only communication of the reasons which in the judgment of the Spanish Court had justified their own action towards the Society up to date, and ought now to induce the Pope to grant a total suppression of the Order. On the other hand, we can see how utterly inadequate these reasons were for the purpose. They could hardly be more vague and impalpable, and we know from the two *Consultas* of November 30th, 1767, and March 23rd, 1768—the effect of whose recommendations is chiefly traceable to the language of this *Memoria*—that their vagueness was intentional. Moreover, the portion touching on the dealings with the Society of various Popes, the behaviour of the Society in regard to missions, and the nature of Jesuit writings on Tyrannicide, was such as could not possibly take in the Holy See, to whom the real truth underlying these malignant insinuations was perfectly well known. On what feature then in this *Memoria* did the Spanish Court count as calculated to impress the Holy See with the urgent necessity of suppressing the Society, and doing it at once? It is but too clear that they counted solely on the force of the threat—not indeed explicitly mentioned in the text, but none the less clearly intimated by the circumstances of its delivery—that in the case of non-compliance, or even further delay, the Powers would not hesitate to resort to fresh and more far-reaching deeds of aggression.

The Neapolitan *Memoria* traverses the same ground as the Spanish, which was to be expected, since it was composed or at least supervised at Madrid, as we learn from a letter of

Grimaldi's to Tanucci, dated December 27th, 1768. There is thus the less need to transcribe it at length, but the following short extract from it must be given just to illustrate the ridiculous style it employs, perhaps under the impression that it was a style suitable to put into the mouth of a youthful Sovereign.

Considering that . . . the fortunate moment should not be lost when the Eternal Wisdom has made manifest the loss which both Church and State . . . have sustained through the way in which the . . . Society of Jesus has abused the piety and patience of Sovereigns, Bishops, and people, his Majesty has not been able to resist the impulse of his charity for the human race, for religion, peace, justice and discipline, and has resolved that Cardinal Orsini shall, in his name, beseech His Holiness to have compassion on the faithful of Jesus Christ placed by the Holy Spirit under his protection. . . .<sup>1</sup>

The French *Memoria* was expressed in simpler and less turgid language, besides which it abstained from all reference to the moral and speculative teaching of the Society. This abstention was designed, as we know from Choiseul's letter to d'Aubeterre of December 27th, 1768.<sup>2</sup> He gives as his reason that he did not wish his Court to be involved in discussions on this point, but perhaps it was also because he could see through the absurdity of the charges brought against this teaching, and did not want to make his King ridiculous by adopting them.

Azpuru presented the Spanish *Memoria* on January 18th, 1769; Orsini the Neapolitan on January 20th; d'Aubeterre the French on January 22nd. Clement received them and dismissed them sadly and courteously, saying but few words, and promising to read their communications. A few days later (on January 28th) Torregiani, on his behalf, wrote to the Nuncios words of protest the justice of which will hardly be denied.<sup>3</sup>

His Holiness cannot understand how the Courts have had the deplorable courage to add this new grief to all those which afflict the Church, and for no other end save to torment still further the conscience of His Holiness, and his afflicted soul. An impartial posterity will judge and will say if such actions can be considered new proofs of the filial love which these Sovereigns boast of cherishing towards His Holiness, or gages of that attachment which they pretend to profess towards the Holy See.

<sup>1</sup> See Danvila, *ibid.*, p. 274.

<sup>2</sup> Theiner, *op. cit.* p. 142.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* i. 145.

It was thus he protested, but, according to Theiner, he was brought by the three Joint Notes to realize the necessity of suppressing the Society, and convoked a Consistory for February 16th to discuss the question. There seems no proof, but it is possible his thoughts may have turned in that direction. A condemnation of the Society in the absolute dearth of any proof to justify it, and in the presence of such manifest proof that the Powers were working a crooked policy, it is not likely that he could ever have brooked; but suppression was a different matter, and he might perhaps have concluded that in view of the intense and growing conspiracy against the Society it would be better for all concerned to grant it. But he was not called upon to decide this anxious question. Cardinal Negroni, in giving audience to the Ambassadors on January 28th, said to them: "This last move of the Courts will open the Holy Father's grave."<sup>1</sup> And so it was. On February 2nd, he sang Mass with his usual devotion, and blessed and distributed the candles. During the day he visited the Blessed Sacrament, exposed for the *Quarant'Ore*, and when the day was over retired to rest without showing signs of illness. But in the night he had an attack of the heart which proved fatal before his nephew, Cardinal Rezzonico, or the Cardinal Secretary, Torregiani, though both were sleeping in neighbouring bed-rooms, could be summoned to his side. He had fought a good fight; he had offered a noble spectacle of moral force contending against physical violence, and, although his reign was one long chronicle of calamities, he must always count among the great Popes.

S. F. S.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

### *The Earliest Cultus of our Lady at Rome.*

---

THE devotion to Mary rests on the same foundation as that to the saints in general. And this foundation has in it a two-fold element: the generically human, and the specifically Christian element which colours the human. The former lies in the fact that men have cherished at all times a remembrance of the dead. If the departed were prominent persons, the remembrance of them has been equally so. Legends have grown up around their names; their birth and their education are inquired into, their biographies are written, poems praise them, art does honour to them, relics of them are treasured. And when we turn to the other element, the distinctively Christian, then the martyrs who laid down their lives for their faith, and who were recognized as having found immediate entrance into Heaven, at a time when it was fancied by certain Fathers that other saints might have to bear a long delay of final beatitude, come before us as in a peculiar manner receiving the homage of the faithful upon earth. Those who were yet fighting the battle of life not only endeavoured to profit from the example set them by these early heroes; they collected their relics, built churches in their honour, celebrated the day of their death, and called upon them in their intercessory prayers. But what about the Holy Mother of God? Surely amongst those worthy of veneration she, as Mother of Him who is the chief object of worship, deserves a high position. That she was reverentially cared for while still upon earth after the death of her Son, we have ample proof in the short sentence, "And from that hour the disciple took her to his own." We have now to show that she was not forgotten after her death.

As the title of our article has already shown, it is on Western usage that we wish to concentrate attention. As to the East, from what we know of its habitual disregard of woman's dignity, we might have suspected that it would have been defective in its *cultus* of Mary; as a fact, however, we are

bound to recognize that the Eastern people were ahead of the Western in devotion to our Blessed Lady. But to return to our subject, the West, we will inquire how it is that at its very centre, Rome, the settlement of our chief feasts in her honour can by Duchesne with any probability be represented as not occurring till the seventh century.

#### I.—SCRIPTURE.

As a preliminary to answering this question, we turn to the earliest records, the Gospels. St. Matthew, indeed, makes mention of Mary, but does little more than state the fact of her marvellous conception. It was left for his successor, St. Luke, to speak in greater detail. From him we learn the epithets, "full of grace," "blessed among women." In his pages Elizabeth acknowledges Mary's superiority, deems herself honoured by the visit; while Mary prophesies concerning herself that she shall be called blessed by all generations. These testimonies, so brief but so pregnant, carry with them the absolute necessity of honour paid always by the Church to Mary: the marks must exist, and we have only to find them out, which will not be a difficult task.

At first the *cultus* of Mary is to be sought in the forms of worship paid to Jesus Christ and to Mary just as they appear together in the pages of the Evangelists. For example, in the Catacombs the incidents of the Gospel narrative from the Annunciation up to the miracle at Cana are, as we shall see later, so depicted that Mother and Son stand together; and the same conjunction is characteristic of the early literature. If with the successive condemnations of Arianism, Nestorianism, Monophysitism, and Monothelitism, the several parts of the Gospel doctrine concerning the Incarnation became distinct, it is not matter for surprise if the distinctness of feasts in honour of Mary was reached only by a similar process of development.

#### II.—THE FEASTS.

To the Western feasts we will now turn our attention.<sup>1</sup> A list of these is to be found in the *Liber Pontificalis*, a title

<sup>1</sup> Our earliest notice of a feast need not, of course, mark the date of its first origin. For example, Baronius, Thomassinus, and others could trace the feast of the Purification no earlier than the sixth century in the time of Justinian. We owe it to the accidental discovery of the *Peregrinatio Silvæ*, in 1885, that we have proof of the feast being kept at Jerusalem in the fourth century, the day of the month being the 14th February. Some might conclude that Silvia is witness also

applied to two books ; one giving sketches of Roman, the other of Ravennese Bishops : to the former we here refer. The work, as a whole, is, we grant, not a critical one ; for we are not likely to meet with any great accuracy in sections written by several hands. But, as all who have examined the book scientifically admit, the second and later portion, *i.e.*, from the end of the sixth century, bears with it an authority of the highest rank ; and certainly the passage with which we are concerned, reads very unlike a forgery. It is an allusion to feasts already recognized under Pope Sergius (687—701), and runs thus :

Constituit autem ut diebus Adnuntiationis Domini, Dormitionis et Nativitatis sanctæ Dei genetricis semperque Virginis Mariæ ac sancti Symeonis, quod Ypapanti Græci appellant, letania exeat a sancto Hadriano et ad sanctam Mariam populus occurrat.

The express mention that certain feasts existed might be an interpolation or a misstatement : but on the assumption that these were certain well-recognized feasts, to mention how on these the order of a procession was settled by the Pope, gives, by the fact that the matter is taken for granted, a more assured ground for believing in the existence of the feasts.

But we must look about for some collateral evidences for or against the above quotation. The *Sacramentaries* are liturgical books of the early ages containing the rites for Mass and the Sacraments generally ; they are represented now-a-days by our Missal, Pontifical, and Ritual. An imperfect Roman Sacramentary was published by Muratori in his *Liturgia Romana Vetus*, and is known as the Leonine ; the Gelasian was published from a ninth century MS. in the Vatican by Cardinal Thomasius. The third, the Gregorian, is a revision of the Gelasian Sacramentary. If these books belonged to the Popes whose names they bear, their dates would be included within the years 440—461, 492—496, 590—604 ; but not only have we no right to assume so much, there seem to be weighty reasons for the contrary opinion. Some of the Masses, for instance in the Leonine, apparently belong to a later date than the death of St. Leo. Duchesne, whom some critics think to be extreme in

to the procession on this day ; but Dom Fernand Cabrol, of Solesmes, thinks that from her words, *processio in Anastase omnes procedunt*, we cannot safely infer more than a large concourse of people at the church. Furthermore, the feast of the Purification, which is so easily taken as a feast of our Lord or as a feast of Mary, is instructive as regards the truth upon which we have repeatedly to insist, that Mother and Son are celebrated together.



the lateness of his date, assigns the Gelasian Sacramentary to about the beginning of the seventh century: Probst is more inclined to accept certain statements of Gennadius and of other early witnesses, as sufficient to prove that Gelasius may fairly retain his title to the work. In face of the difficulties about origin and subsequent variations of Sacramentaries, it is hard for us to speak with any certainty on the subject we have in hand; but as these books now exist we find:

(a) *The Leonine* makes no mention of the four feasts spoken of in the *Liber Pontificalis*; we may notice, however, that the section which includes the months of August and September is now missing, where we might have hoped to find mention of our Lady's Assumption and Nativity.

(β) *The Gelasian* gives all the four; it is true that it does not speak explicitly of her *bodily* Assumption, but we need not make too much of such a negative argument.

(γ) *The Gregorian*, in nearly all copies, gives the four, and in contrast to the Gelasian, does speak clearly of the bodily Assumption.

In connexion with these two sources of information, it is somewhat surprising to find no mention made of these same feasts in the homilies of either St. Leo or St. Gregory; but again, as the argument is negative, there is still room for the possibility that in spite of their frequent sermons neither of these famous Pontiffs had occasion to treat of the feasts; or if they had, that their words are no longer extant. More evidence however remains against too favourable a deduction from the *Liber Pontificalis* and the Sacramentaries. Of two Roman Martyrologies of the fourth century, namely, the Hieronymian and Philocalian, the former seems to have at least the Assumption as a later interpolation, while the latter has none of the four—a fact which may be not very significant after all.

Finally, the Martyrology of St. Willibrord marks no feast for 25th March, nor 15th August, nor 8th September; but to the 16th August—and this points to an imperfect knowledge of the Roman usage—it assigns her Nativity, while for the 2nd February we find the words, “et Hierosolyma, sancti Simeonis (and at Jerusalem [the feast of] St. Simeon).” The last quotation seems to agree very well with what we have



already read in the biography of Sergius. Upon a review of the whole evidence accessible, which is not much, Duchesne is of opinion that the four feasts were established at Rome only during the seventh century.

III.—THE EARLY FATHERS IN THE WEST.

It will not be without interest to examine into another form in which the Roman devotion to our Blessed Lady can be traced, namely, to see how she was spoken of in early sermons. Three Western Fathers are well suited for our purpose, St. Ambrose, his disciple St. Augustine, and St. Jerome. They were champions of Mary's perpetual virginity against Jovinian, and in their doctrine they honour her :

1. *As the worthy Mother of God.* Let us start with St. Ambrose.<sup>1</sup> A commentary is not a continuous discourse, and so we are to expect in it no formal treatise on Mary's privileges ; enough for us that we find in it a perpetual regard to her dignities traceable to the fact of her great position—that her motherhood is insisted on, and at the same time her virginity and its guardianship, first under the care of St. Joseph and then of St. John.

St. Ambrose calls her the type of the Church which is immaculate and yet wedded. She alone is worthy to be called "full of grace." And then he exhorts the virgins whom he is addressing to imitate this Mother in her admirable purity and humility. For in the Visitation which resulted from the Annunciation, Mary had not only taken the initiative, but had been the first to utter words of greeting :

It was becoming [says the Saint] that she who was the more pure virgin, should be the more humble.

Again, *apropos* of verse 45 :

Let the soul of Mary be in you all, that it may praise our Lord ; let the spirit of Mary be in you all, that it may rejoice in God. If there is one Mother of Christ according to the flesh, still Christ is the fruit of all according to faith.

And in another place :<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless, that birth of the one holy virgin is the honour of all holy virgins. And they with Mary are mothers of Christ if they do the

<sup>1</sup> Migne, *P.L.* tom. 15, col. 1,551—1,561, where he is commenting on Luke i. 26—43.

<sup>2</sup> *De Sancta Virg.* Migne, *P.L.* tom. 40, col. 399.

will of His Father. With all the more praise and blessedness to herself is Mary the Mother of God, on account of that saying of His, "Who-soever does the will of My Father, he is My brother, and sister, and mother." By doing God's will, therefore, Mary passes beyond being merely the Mother of Christ according to the body, and becomes spiritually His sister and His mother.

To make the transition now from master to pupil, or from converter to convert, St. Augustine, speaking of Mary's position on Calvary,<sup>1</sup> says :

But Mary, as indeed behoved the Mother of Christ, even when the Apostles deserted Him, remained standing at the foot of the Cross, and gazed with fond eyes at the wounds of her Son; for what she had before her eyes was not so much the death of her dear Son as the salvation of the world. Or perhaps because she had recognized the world's redemption in the death of her Son, she believed that, as the King's Mother, she would, by her own death, contribute something to the work He was accomplishing. . . . The passage in the Gospel of St. Luke gives a model to maternal love, and shows an example for filial reverence to follow.

This reference to Mary's splendid fidelity at the foot of the Cross is the more notable because her conduct there seems to be described less worthily by Origen, St. Basil, and St. Cyril of Alexandria.

2. *As the worthy Mother of regenerate mankind, inasmuch as she is the second Eve.* In Sermon 232, ch. 2,<sup>2</sup> St. Augustine is reminding his hearers at Eastertide how in spite of all the wonders which the Apostles had witnessed at the hands of their Master, they were yet unwilling to believe the news of the Resurrection from the lips of a woman. He continues :

O great misfortune of the lot of mankind. When Eve had repeated what the serpent had said, she was easily believed. A woman telling a falsehood was believed, that we might die ; no faith was placed in woman that we might live. If women are not to be believed, why did Adam believe Eve? If women are to be believed, why did not the Apostles believe the holy women? And in this fact we are to observe the kind dispensation of our Lord. For He so arranged that women should be the first to announce His Resurrection. Because mankind fell by a woman, by a woman it was restored ; because a virgin had given birth to Christ, a woman gave tidings of His Resurrection. Death by a woman, life by a woman.

<sup>1</sup> Migne, *P.L.* tom. 15, col. 1,837.

<sup>2</sup> Migne, *P.L.* tom. 38, col. 1,108.

And once more when, speaking of our Lord's birth,<sup>1</sup> he says:

But how He was born and appeared to men has now to be told; and accordingly we have the narrative upon which we believe that Christ our Lord was not only born of the everlasting God, co-eternal to Him who before all ages, before all creatures begot the Son, by whom were made all things; but also that He was born of the Holy Ghost by the Virgin Mary, which we likewise profess. . . . For this faith thousands of martyrs have been slain throughout the wide world.

Perhaps we may pause here to acknowledge a fact curious indeed, but still, as Newman has pointed out in his letter to Pusey, not really detracting from the genuine tradition of the Fathers to Mary's matchless purity of conscience. Some of the Fathers<sup>2</sup> thought they could see venial sins in our Lady's life. Out of these not numerous examples we will select two, which are the chief, and contain the whole gist of the difficulty, namely, the charge of a certain over-forwardness or vanity, and the charge of failure in constancy or courage. St. Chrysostom, for instance,<sup>3</sup> thinks she must have been guilty of vainglory at Cana by wishing to lay a claim upon the family under whose roof she was being entertained, and to get a little more honour for herself; and this it was, he thinks, that brought a rough answer from our Lord. Again, he accuses her of being too forward in her desire to see her Son on His return to His old surroundings.<sup>4</sup> But still more strange is the opinion of SS. Cyril and Basil, who think that she lost courage and was scandalized on Calvary. If we must give an answer to these views, perhaps the safest is to admit that the writers were in the wrong; they were but men, though remarkable both for holiness and learning; nevertheless, like any other men, they could make mistakes. Thus we are not driven by necessity to fall back on the apology of ambiguity in the passages referred to, though we are ready to admit that it is sometimes beyond the power of even the most carefully guarded writers to ensure that the opinions they are expressing will at any future time be so construed as to bear the sense they were originally meant to convey.

<sup>1</sup> Migne, *P.L.* tom. 38, col. 338.

<sup>2</sup> We admit that these Fathers do not belong to our subject, "The Church at Rome;" nevertheless, it seems worth while to quote them, for they might seem to diminish the force of the Roman tradition.

<sup>3</sup> Migne, *P.G.* 59, col. 130.

<sup>4</sup> Migne, *P.G.* 57, col. 464.

3. *As the most perfect of God's creatures.* St. Ambrose,<sup>1</sup> in his letter to Eusebius, shows how incongruous it would have been if she, who had been chosen the Mother of our Lord, had not persevered to the end in her virginity.

To whom rather than His Mother [he writes] should our Lord have granted the merit and reward of perseverance? As Scripture tells us, to nobody do rewards fall more plentifully than to the virgin.<sup>2</sup> He assures others that they shall not fall away; did He allow His Mother to do so? No, Mary did not fail; the mistress of Virginity did not fall away.

And once again, when speaking of her perplexity at the Annunciation:<sup>3</sup>

For Mary alone was this greeting kept. And rightly is she alone called "full of grace" who alone obtained the grace which no one else had merited, viz., to be filled with the Author of all grace.

A short sentence from St. Jerome may fitly conclude this heading.<sup>4</sup> In enumerating a list of remarkable women mentioned either in Scripture or in some of the early classical literature, he says:

I say nothing about Anna and Elizabeth, and the other holy women, whose light, small in comparison as that of the stars, Mary's brilliancy outshines.

If the above specimens from three Western Fathers—and be it remembered, they are only specimens—should to some appear not very forcible, the reason will probably be because of the want of direct invocations made to Mary. On this subject we will say a word at the end; for the present we are content to observe that there is the essential *cultus* of Mary in the reverent celebration of her as Mother of God. Such honour the Fathers quoted above do unmistakably pay to her: and, moreover, at times they directly address her, having for this the warrant of St. Elizabeth, when she said, "Blessed art thou among women." Already Irenæus<sup>5</sup> had spoken of Mary as "Eve's advocate:" in St. Ephrem invocations of Mary abound: invocations of the martyrs were frequent from the first, and contain the justification for making the like recourse

<sup>1</sup> *De Instit. Virg.* Migne, *P.L.* tom. 16, col. 317.

<sup>2</sup> *Isaias lvi. 3, seq.*

<sup>3</sup> Migne, *P.L.* tom. 15, col. 1,556.

<sup>4</sup> Migne, *P.L.* tom. 15, col. 1,337.

<sup>5</sup> v. 19.

to the Queen of Martyrs. It was a question of time, how long it would take the living, developing Church to attain the rich exuberance of devotion to Mary as it is now known to her clients.

IV.—ART IN THE CATACOMBS.

Our next investigations shall be in the department of art. The Catacombs at Rome are very strong in support of our original assertion, namely, that in honour Mary went side by side with her Son, just as she is honoured in the Gospel narrative when it describes the relations of Mother and Son—a description which it rarely gives after the event of the marriage-feast of Cana, where certainly Mary was rather honoured than not. But before entering into details, we must bear in mind that representations, in whatever form they are found, are not of themselves a conclusive proof of devotion. Suppose, for instance, we were to see a picture or statue of the Madonna in the house of an atheist, we should not conclude that the inmate was a client of the Mother of God; the representation might indeed point to his æsthetic or artistic tastes, but to argue further would be rash. Again, the fact that the pictures, or carvings, or glasswork of the first centuries put before us the Blessed Virgin with her Child, it would again be imprudent to say that *therefore* devotion to Mary is as ancient as that to her Son. We find pictures of the Child surrounded by shepherds or by the doctors in the Temple, but it does not follow that the latter were objects of veneration. Far from it. But this much we may say: the Catacombs were the substitute for churches; public and private devotion could no longer be carried on above ground, the evils of persecution had forced the early Christians to hide themselves and every proof of their religion from the sight of their enemies. So that for indications of early Christian devotions we cannot do better than see what the Catacombs tell us. Now in them Mary certainly does not appear, as does Orpheus, for a purpose purely symbolic, nor is she a profane adjunct to sacred pictures: unmistakably her place is one of honour, by the side of her most worshipful Son. To put any other interpretation on the fact is rationally impossible. Let us see what some of these facts are.

The oldest representation of our Blessed Lady is attributed

by de Rossi to times when the voice of the Apostles, or at least its echo, still resounded in the Church. The picture was found on a table-tomb, and consists of our Lady holding the Child at her breast, and a young and almost beardless man—who is commonly thought to be the Prophet Isaias—standing opposite to them. On the same monument we have another picture, which again by many is taken to represent the Holy Family. But the most frequent position in which Mary appears with her Child is that where they are receiving the adoration of the Magi.<sup>1</sup> De Rossi speaks of more than twenty paintings of this scene in the Catacombs, and it is still more common in sculpture; but none are earlier than the third century. Nor indeed need we wonder that this was the favourite theme with the early Christians at Rome. For though the Epiphany as an appointed feast-day may at first have not received a special reference to the call of the Gentiles, but may have commemorated rather Christ's manifestation at His birth, at His baptism, and at the marriage of Cana, yet the event in itself always bore that reference which the Gentiles would have been pleased to recognize. Now by the third century the majority of the faithful must have been Gentiles. Once more, in the Catacomb on the Via Nomentana, which goes by the name of St. Agnes, our Blessed Lady is painted on the lunette of an arcosolium with her arms outstretched in prayer, with the Divine Infant in front of her, quite unsupported. The monogram is on either side, and from both sides it is made to turn towards the centre. De Rossi assigns the work to the age of Constantine, that is, the earlier half of the fourth century. The chief interest, however, in connection with this picture consists in the fact that the position of the Holy Child with reference to the Mother, is one which has always been held in special favour in the Greek Church. It is to be seen on the seals of upwards of thirty convents on Mount Athos, all dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and remains to the present day a favourite Russian type of the Madonna.

<sup>1</sup> A picture in the Catacombs of the Magi visiting the infant Saviour is not subject to the ambiguities attendant on the name and the feast of the Epiphany. For Silvia the feast of the Epiphany at Jerusalem was the feast of the Nativity, and was kept on January 6th, one of the many conjectural days of our Lord's birth, other days being March 28th, April 18th, or 19th, or 20th. Antioch seems first to vouch for our December 25th.



V.—ROMAN CHURCHES IN HONOUR OF MARY.

Passing now from underground Rome (the Catacombs), we must see what is of interest above ground. De Rossi,<sup>1</sup> in his catalogue of churches dedicated to our Blessed Lady from the beginning of the seventh century, mentions four in the following order: Sancta Maria Major, Sancta Maria Antiqua, Sancta Maria Rotunda, Sancta Maria Trans Tiberim. Of these the second claims our attention. By some authorities it has been identified with what is now known as St. Francesca Romana, and formerly as Sancta Maria Nova, deriving that name, as they think, from the renovation of the old building. However, Father Grisar, S.J., in his *Geschichte Roms und die Päpste im Mittelalter*,<sup>2</sup> shows grounds for thinking that this opinion is a mistaken one. Sancta Maria Nova, according to him, is the continuation of the Church of St. Peter on the Via Sacra, a view which he has gathered from the *Itinerarium Einsiedlense*, where we are told that the Sancta Maria Antiqua did not stand on the Via Sacra, but near the old temple of Vesta at the foot of the Palatine Hill. It is this fact which Father Grisar urges to identify the old church of our Lady, the Antiqua, with what is now known as Maria Liberatrice. Connecting this title with an old legend, he pushes further his argument drawn from the *Itinerarium Einsiedlense*. Both testimonies agree to the site, the legend adding that it was in the neighbourhood of the chasm into which Quintius Curtius plunged by an act of heroic self-devotedness for the salvation of his country. The story goes on to say that a dragon dwelt in that locality deep down underground, that food was lowered to him by virgins, but that after the celebration of Divine Service in that neighbourhood, Pope Silvester by the power of prayer reduced him to a state of helpless imprisonment.

So ran the Silvestrian legend in the sixth century. We know that in the later middle ages a small church borrowed from the chasm its name, *de inferno* or *de lacu*. *Infernum*, which is another name for Hell, was connected in that sense by the people with the dragon story; and out of the same connexion arose the full title which the edifice eventually received: *Sancta Maria libera nos de pœnis inferni* (deliver us from Hell), whence it appears that the modern name of S. Maria Liberatrice is but a contraction of the fuller one. Father Grisar, taking

<sup>1</sup> *Roma Sott.* i. 143.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. i. p. 194.



the victory over the dragon as a symbol of the defeat of paganism and of the overthrow of the temple of Vesta, supposes Silvester (314—316) to have built this church, the oldest church of our Lady known to us. If the opinion of the learned German be correct, we have a signal mark of the spirit animating the converted Romans. Vesta had been the object of divine *cultus* in pagan days and the protectress of the city. To have erected a shrine to the Holy Mother of God, the protectress of Christians, right in view of Vesta's temple, would be a fitting publication of early Roman devotion to Mary. This was the spot which spoke of the oldest Roman traditions; Vesta's shrine with its fire and its virgins was the emblem and pledge of Roman sovereignty throughout the world. Where could the early clients of Mary find a more fitting site whereon, without detriment to the pre-eminence of the Divinity, they could place a proof of their devotion to one who was truly Mother of God and truly Virgin of more than Vestal purity?

By the side of S. Maria Liberatrice we may mention briefly an ancient shrine (not necessarily the nearest in age), S. Maria in Capitolio, or as it is now called, S. Maria in Ara Coeli. The latter name reminds us of the legend about the promise which the Emperor Augustus received concerning the virginal birth of a Divine Child. The text of the oldest chronicle as handed down by the Byzantine historian, Timotheus, bears the date 574, and runs as follows:

In the fifty-sixth year of his reign Cæsar Augustus betook himself to the Capitol in the month of October, which was called Hyperbereteus by the Athenians (more correctly the Macedonians). This (the Capitol) stood in the middle of the city. His intention was to find out by divination who would bear the sceptre in the Roman kingdom after his death. And from Pythonia he received this answer: "At God's command a Hebrew Child will descend from the home of the Blessed, and take His place in this building. He will be born immaculate, and will be an enemy to our altars." Whereupon Cæsar Augustus left the abode of the oracle, and built a large altar on an eminence in the Capitol: and upon it in Latin letters he wrote: "This is the altar of the Son of God"—*Hæc ara filii Dei est*. And to this day after so many years the building and the Basilica of Mary, ever a Virgin, is still standing, as Timotheus the chronicler tells us.<sup>1</sup>

But we must dwell more especially upon a more important church, that which occurs first in the catalogue given by De Rossi, viz., St. Maria Major.<sup>2</sup> Of all the churches of our Lady in

<sup>1</sup> Grisar, vol. i. pp. 197, 198.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 297 ff.

the world it takes the highest rank. Pope Liberius had indeed erected a Basilica on the same part of the Esquiline, but shortly after the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus, Pope Xystus (or Sixtus) III. (352—356) rebuilt it, dedicated it to our Blessed Lady, and adorned it with mosaic representations of her life and the Infancy of her Child. Of mosaic art in the fifth century our most important examples are furnished by the Church of St. Mary Major. In the crown of the triumphal arch a golden inscription gives the greeting, "Bishop Xystus to the people of God." It is surmounted by a picture of God's Throne between symbols of the Evangelists and the figures of SS. Peter and Paul. The historical mosaics begin on the left, of which the first shows our Lady in a rich garment seated on a throne, her feet resting on a stool, while the Angel is bringing his message of glad tidings. The Holy Ghost, in the form of a dove, descends upon Mary; two winged angels stand reverently behind her, taking, as it were, a share in the embassy, while two other angels are conveying the news of the miraculous conception to St. Joseph. To the right of this picture we find another representing the Presentation in the Temple. The Virgin Mother, again accompanied by two angels, is passing through the halls of the Temple. Her dress is as rich as in the former picture; a golden cross over the diadem round the Child's Head points to His higher dignity. Simeon, at the sight of the Mother of God, is stepping forward from the group of priests and attendants; his outstretched hands, reverently covered with a cloth, seem to ask for the Child, and his open lips are proclaiming Him to be the Saviour of the world.<sup>2</sup> Then the space between the aged servant of God and the Mother and Child is filled by three other figures, to wit, the widow Anna, who with uplifted arms is proclaiming the Divinity of Christ, and St. Joseph, with an Angel, who is standing a little way back, as his companion.

Still further to the right we have the Flight into Egypt, which stands over the scene representing the three Kings in the presence of Herod. The series is then begun again on the left side of the arch. The visit of the Magi is in this way painted under the Annunciation; the picture, however, is imperfect, as the portion where one of the visitors should be standing has fallen away, a fact which may also explain the absence of St. Joseph. The last scene on this side shows the killing of the Innocents and a group of the sorrowful mothers.

<sup>2</sup> St. Luke ii. 31, 32.

In the lower part of the arch the usual pictures of Jerusalem and Bethlehem fill the space, and a reason seems to be called for why no representation of the Birth of our Lord has had a share in this beautiful work. Father Grisar suggests that such an addition would have been superfluous, seeing that the Basilica has already, near the high altar, a chapel designed to represent the Nativity.

We may now state what we suppose to be the result of the several arguments which we have been propounding. It is not our claim that within the narrow limits to which we have restricted our inquiry, we have found in the earliest centuries evidence for a direct "petition to Mary that she would lend help to the needy"—such a petition as may be seen among the Greeks in the 24th Oration of St. Gregory Nazianzen.<sup>1</sup> And yet from St. Ambrose<sup>2</sup> we might have urged the teaching deducible from his account of a vision, in which a company of virgins who have gained their place in Heaven, are represented as acknowledging their debt to Mary for their triumph. We were the less concerned to utilize this passage because we have to insist that the prayer of petition not being the highest form of prayer, is no indispensable sign of a genuine *cultus*. The highest kind of prayer, the kind characteristic of primitive liturgies in comparison with modern books of prayer, is that of simple praise or homage. Hence we have urged that all along Mary was receiving the essentials of a devotion in her honour from the Church at Rome. Beginning with the honourable position which in the Gospels she holds by the side of her Son, we have found a separate honour—or at least an approach to a separate honour—paid to her in four feasts mentioned as firmly established by the time of Pope Sergius. Three Western Fathers have been selected by us to speak of Roman devotion to Mary, to wit, SS. Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome. Roman art has borne the same testimony. Here, then, is at least the living nucleus of the body of devotion which has been developed so extensively in successive ages and which bulks so large in the Church of to-day. Devotions are things which slowly evolve: even individual feasts are seen to acquire a definite significance only by stages, not to have it at the outset. So it was with the feasts of Christmas and of the Epiphany as they refer to our Lord; why should not Mary's feasts show a like tardiness and a like fluctuation?

G. J. PFAEHLER.

<sup>1</sup> N. 11.

<sup>2</sup> *De Virgin.* lib. ii. cap. 11, nn. 11, 15.

### *Some Side-Lights on the Pre-Historic Period.*

---

SOME little time ago Professor Haddon published an account<sup>1</sup> of the observations made during a visit to the Torres Straits, by a body of persons, of whom he was the chief, interested in the study of anthropology. It is a book full of interesting information, most pleasantly written, stuffed with facts and first-hand observations, and one which all Catholics should read for the sake of the delightfully sympathetic account which the author gives of the Sacred Heart missions of the district which he visited. Of none of these matters, however, do we now propose to write, but rather to set down a few thoughts which the book gives rise to, in connection with the subject of the pre-historic age in this and other European countries. For the study of that period we have no written documents, nothing but those objects belonging to it which were least perishable or most carefully secreted in tombs and elsewhere by their original possessors. For the implements they are there before our eyes and can be described, but for their uses we have to resort either to surmise, or to observation of those races of mankind which are at a lower stage of civilization—at least of material civilization—than the inhabitants of this quarter of the world. That we are able thus to appeal to the peoples of one age and part of the world, to explain the doings of those far removed from them by time and by geographical location, is due to the essential similarity of the minds of men wherever they may exist, and the practically identical lines upon which the problems of savage life have everywhere been attacked and solved. Take the arrow-head made of some hard stone, the axe of a similar material, the scraper, the knife of flint, implements of the first importance to man in bringing down his prey, animal or human, in preparing the skins with which to clothe himself; useful and valuable to him in a hundred other ways. Such implements are to be found all the world over, it may truly be said, and all

<sup>1</sup> *Head-Hunters, Black, White, and Brown.* London; Methuen and Co., 1901.

the world over with a striking similarity to one another. As regards this similarity of view, there is a really striking instance in Professor Haddon's book. It is perhaps known to the readers of this Magazine, that the axe-heads made of flint, of quartzite, or of some other hard stone, commonly called celts, and to be seen in almost every museum throughout these islands, are, or certainly up to a very short time ago were, called "thunderbolts," and were supposed to have fallen from the heavens during violent storms.

This idea is not confined to these islands, for the same opinion is prevalent in Denmark, where Professor Wilson met a man who actually stated that he had seen such a hatchet descend from heaven in a flash of lightning, and exhibited the implement itself as a proof that his statement was a fact and not a lively piece of imagination. "There is the back drawing-room still on the first floor and still at the back of the house to confirm my words," as the niece of Mr. F.'s aunt remarked. There is nothing wonderful in such a view being held in two countries so near and so closely connected historically as Britain and Denmark. But when we find in West Africa, Shango, the god of thunder and lightning, also known as Jakuta, the stone-thrower, represented in some castings with a stone axe in his hand, we are getting a good deal farther afield. The most remarkable instance of this idea, however, which we have as yet met with, is to be found in Professor Haddon's book. Penetrating into the interior of Borneo to a point visited previously by very few white men, the explorer noticed amongst a bunch of charms hung up in one of the native long-houses, an evident polished stone implement. After great difficulty this was procured from its possessors and proved to be a stone adze-head which had been found in the bed of a river. The inhabitants, who are acquainted with the use of iron, and must for a considerable period of time have left the stone age behind them, had no idea what this implement really was, but spoke of it as "*Silun Baling Go*," that is, the toe-nail of Baling Go, the thunder-god, and supposed it to have fallen from the sky. Here there can have been, so far as we can see, no possibility of the transmission of the tale, and if such be the case, then we are forced to believe that the same remarkable story must have originated independently in different parts of the world. Wherever it originated, it is clear that it must always have done so at a period long after stone axes had

been in use, and therefore at a period when some considerable advance had been made along the road of material improvement. It is possible to find a theory to account for this idea. Undoubtedly aerolites do fall from the skies, and sometimes do so during storms. So that the primitive man has so much fact to go upon. Then he comes upon a curiously shaped piece of stone, unlike anything with which he is acquainted, and he forms the idea that this too must have fallen from heaven, and, if it is obvious that it has been artificially shaped, he attributes its formation to the deity who presides over storms, thunder, and lightning. Perhaps this is not at all the line of argument by which the conclusion has been reached, for one must always beware of supposing that the apparently obvious is therefore the actual train of thought in the savage mind. At any rate it offers a suggestion as to the path by which different races of men may have reached, as they undoubtedly did reach, the same goal, in deliberating as to the origin of these stone axe-heads. The fact that they have reached the same goal is a good instance of what we have been alluding to, namely, the essential similarity of the workings of the minds of different races.

There are several instances in this book of the use of implements very commonly found in this country, and evidently made and used in large quantities during the pre-historic period. Amongst these is the stone celt or adze-head. At Keapara, on the Hood Peninsula of New Guinea, Professor Haddon saw and photographed men hollowing out a canoe with implements of this character, and this, be it specially noted, in a district where the use of iron was perfectly well known, and where tools of that metal were constantly being employed. In fact, close by the "stone-age" boat-makers, was a man chipping out a bowl with a miniature adze, the blade of which was made of iron. Indeed, it appears that the outside of the canoe is actually shaped with iron tomahawks, the stone implement being reserved for the interior, perhaps, the author thinks, "because they are frightened lest the sharper iron blade should inadvertently cut through the thin side of the hull." Now from this instance we not only see how the boats of the men of the Neolithic period were shaped, but we learn the very instructive lesson that what appears to our eyes to be the less efficient implement, is in the hands of those who use it more useful than the tool of a more advanced civilization. It is not an obvious fact, and it should teach us caution in our reasonings about



primitive man and his ways. Moreover, it helps us to understand the overlap of certain implements from one period to another. People are too apt to imagine that the Stone, Bronze, and Iron periods were as sharply divided from one another as the reign of one Sovereign is from that of his successor. A very little consideration of the facts will show that this is a wholly incorrect idea, and a little further consideration will prove that it is quite absurd to suppose such a thing to have been at all likely. We know, for example, that stone mauls or axe-heads were actually used at the Battle of Senlac, probably two thousand years, at least, after the commencement of the bronze period. Again, very few bronze arrow-heads have been found amongst the numerous material relics of that period, and it seems most probable that there may have been very few made at any time. Bronze must always have been a valuable substance, and arrow-heads are from the nature of things very likely to be lost. Hence it was much cheaper to make them of sharp pieces of stone, or of bone, or some other hard substance, equally efficacious and less costly than the metal characteristic of the period. Such considerations should teach us to be cautious in speaking of the age of any particular implement. What looks like a Palæolithic flint may be an unfinished implement of a later date, and so on with other objects. The greater our knowledge—if indeed the faint glimmer of light which we possess concerning those early periods can be dignified with that name—the less we are inclined to dogmatize as to dates, and even, in many cases, as to purposes.

Take the stone circles, so remarkable in their nature and construction. Our predecessors in the archæological field, with all the courage of ignorance, were quite clear that these were Druidical temples; they knew that human sacrifices took place there, and would even point out to the visitor the block of stone on which the victim lay and the gutters down which his blood ran. Great are the wonders of the imagination, and great too its uses, for the scientific man, who has no imagination, is a poor creature, but imagination is a steed which must always be kept well under control, and we, the descendants of Stukeley and his fanciful colleagues, are obliged to confess that of the purposes of these circles we know precisely nothing, however much we may form surmises. If it were legitimate to pursue this subject further here, it would be a



rather fascinating thing to compare these edifices with the Kwods and other tabu grounds, in which the initiation ceremonies of the young men of the villages took place, so ably described in the book which has provoked these rambling notes.

To pass to another point, in the regions with which the work deals there are to be found villages built in shallow water upon piles, exactly like the pre-historic villages of the Swiss lakes, from the ruins of which such an abundant store of implements of various kinds has been obtained. In fact when one reads the descriptions and examines the pictures of these constructions, one can well imagine that one is studying some contemporary treatise upon the Swiss villages. For the origin of this kind of village we have not far to seek for an explanation. The villages were so built for the protection of their owners, who found that a good sheet of water between them and the land was an excellent safeguard against the sudden onslaughts of enemies. Such an idea has prompted the construction of many kinds of edifices and fortress. The Irish crannoge, used up to a comparatively late date in history, was an artificial island constructed of piles and stones in the waters of a lake, and the Norman castle, where it possessed, as it usually did, a moat, was a piece of land which had been artificially turned into an island by the making of a lake around it. But what has sometimes puzzled writers on pre-historic subjects is how the piles for the village were driven into the ground. Probably most of the readers of this article have watched at some time or another the driving of piles for some purpose by the sea-side and will be familiar with the piece of apparatus employed; the raising of the heavy weight, its release, and its fall upon the head of the pile which is being driven. Such pieces of machinery were not available to primitive man, and he had to devise simpler, yet not less efficacious though slower, methods of achieving his purpose. Professor Haddon saw the operation taking place and has described for us what may well have been the identical method pursued by the early inhabitants of the Swiss valleys. "A post," he says, "was procured, one end of which was roughly pointed, and to the other extremity two long ropes were tied. One man scooped a hole on the reef at low tide with his hands; the pile was then propped up in the hole by several men. Two or three men steadied the post while several caught hold of each guy and gently swayed it

to and fro; the men who clasped the pole prevented it from overbalancing. Gradually by its own weight the pile is thus wormed into the ground. I was," he adds, "informed that when a pile is sunk actually in the sea a light staging is erected near the top of the post; two or three men stand on this framework, so that by their extra weight the pile may sink more readily."

There are a number of other instances in the book with which we have been dealing where the customs of modern races, low in their stage of culture, throw a light upon those remote days in which man first wandered up and down this land of ours. There is the description of how pottery is made without the potter's wheel, as it was made for so many ages in this land. There is also the account of the finding of model, or perhaps we should call them imitation implements on tombs, which reminds one of the tiny and useless bronze and stone implements sometimes found in early graves. But the examples which have been given must suffice, and those who desire further knowledge on the subject will find themselves well rewarded by seeking for it in the pages of a most deeply interesting book.

B. C. A. WINDLE.

## *A Symposium on the Atonement.*

---

IN 1856, at Oxford, was published a volume of Collected Sermons from the pens of contributors varying in their opinions, but having avowedly the common purpose of controversy, "in reference to the views published by Mr. Jowett and others." Pusey was one of the preachers, and, as we may well suppose, he did not relish Jowett's plan of giving up all theory about the redemption, on the grounds that "the less we define the better," since "definite statements respecting the relation of Christ, either to God or to man, are only figures of speech which do not really pierce the clouds that round our little life."<sup>1</sup> Later, Murray's Dictionary has furnished four definitions of atonement, adding under the fourth head the note, "As applied to the redemptive work of Christ, atonement is variously used by theologians in the sense of *reconciliation*, *propitiation*, *expiation*, according to the views taken of its nature."

In the winter of 1899-1900, the *Christian World* published a Symposium on the well-known subject in which part was taken by some contributors from abroad, writing under the familiar names of Godet, Harnack, and Sabatier.<sup>2</sup> From this volume we will select a few illustrative topics, without pretending to summarize results; an undertaking which would be difficult in the case of independent minds who do not pretend to a common basis of doctrine.

### I.

One point that strikes us is that where a novel theory is ventured upon, it does not carry with it the recommendation which would tempt us to accept it in place of traditional opinions that can make no bid for popularity on the score of novelty. Take, for example, the first Essay, which at pages

<sup>1</sup> Concluding paragraph in the *Essay on the Atonement*.

<sup>2</sup> *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought*. London: James Clarke and Co., 1900.

24 and 25 ventures on a new speculation: "The key to a theory of the doctrine seems to me to be supplied firstly by the acceptance of the hypothesis, that the origin of *moral evil is in God*." Here the italics belong to the author. His view is that God wanted to have in His creatures an intelligent pursuit of virtue, which involves a knowledge of good and evil and also a certain bias to evil. Consequently God created man with the evil bias in his nature; so far God is author of evil. But not simply God: more especially the Son of God, who is "that side of the Divine Nature which has-gone forth in creation, which contains humanity, and which is present in every act and article of human experience. Jesus is thus seen to be associated with the existence of the primordial evil which has its origin in God." A theory of this kind puts before the mind, in a very crude way, what is contained, and more than is contained, in the words of God:<sup>1</sup> "I form the light and create the darkness, I make peace and evil: I am the Lord that do all these things."

From his starting-point, however, the author has an easy explanation of Christ's redemption: God as a condition of real virtue created man with a bias to evil: the Son of God specially represents this creative act: hence there was a call upon the Son to assume the office of rescuer. It is as if a father first sent his boy into the corrupt world to learn self-control, and then himself followed the lad to be with him as supporter and as teacher under the hard burden of the lesson. "Christ has not sinned in man, but He takes responsibility for that experience of evil into which humanity is born. . . . He not only knows but feels and shares the woe of the world. The going forth of God in creation may be explained in two ways. He goes forth to suffer and suffers in man: He creates evil that man may know good. The Eternal Son, in whom humanity is contained, is therefore a sufferer since creation began. This mysterious passion of Deity must continue until Redemption is consummated and humanity restored to God. Thus every consequence of human ill is felt in the experience of Christ. No single human being can endure more of those consequences than fall to his lot for the sake of discipline: Christ endures them all. Calvary is the point at which we can touch this great mystery. By taking responsibility for the origin of moral evil, Christ severs the entail between the

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah xlv. 7.

penitent and his guilt, frees him from association with it, removes the barrier or inhibition between him and good, and makes holiness possible."<sup>1</sup> The Catholic theologian will see in the above views a sort of naturalization of Christ's office: He came as a sort of necessity to undo one essential flaw in creation, to counteract that bias to evil which God through His Son implanted in man as a condition of positive virtue. Thus the Son of God was under an obligation to repair the defects in the work of creation.

It may be observed that the author speaks of "a mysterious passion of the Deity, who was a sufferer since creation began." The notion that the Deity itself could suffer appears also in other parts of the Symposium. Thus at page 64 it is said: "We have outgrown the idea that the Redemption cost the Father nothing, that He had only to receive the payment, or cover the sacrifice which the Son made. We realize more clearly that the Son could not suffer without the Father suffering." When such misconception is possible, we do not wonder to find the statement, that in the God-Man it was not the Man but God who performed the redemptive act, our own doctrine being of course that the Man yielded Himself obediently to death, while the dignity of His Divine Personality gave to His human act an infinite value. "It was not Man in Christ," we are told, "suffering on behalf of man, who reconciled the world to God: it was God in Christ who reconciled the world to Himself."<sup>2</sup> How much of the sound theology of the Incarnation is upset by the last sentence, if it be taken in all its exclusiveness, it will not be difficult for experts to calculate.

A second illustration of a novelty in theory which is the opposite of an improvement upon the old tradition, is afforded by Harnack's theory, which displays the author's characteristic love of arbitrary innovation. "There is," he affirms, "an inner law which compels the sinner to look upon God as a wrathful Judge. It is the conception of God which is the hardest and most real punishment inflicted on sin. It tears the heart of man, transforms his thought, robs him of his peace, and drives him to despair. This conception of God is a false one, and yet it is not false, for it is the necessary consequence of man's sin—that is to say, of his godlessness."<sup>3</sup> Thus by sinning man is led to regard God as an enemy who can no longer be conciliated: all hope is taken away. The

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 25, 27, 28.<sup>2</sup> P. 98.<sup>3</sup> P. 122.

effect of redemption is to manifest the goodness and the forgivingness of God, and to remove at once sin, the cause, and despair, its effect. "When the Holy One descends to sinners, when He lives with them and walks with them, when He does not count them unworthy but calls them His brethren, then their terror of the awful Judge melts away, and they believe that the Holy One is love, and that *there is something mightier still than Justice—Mercy.*"<sup>1</sup> Here is justification by faith in God's mercy: "If they believe then they are reconciled. This is the fundamental form of the Christian belief of Atonement. . . . I would avoid alleging that every Christian must think so." We may add, no Christian can think so if he is aware of the inmost purpose of the Incarnation of the Son of God, whose Divinity Harnack denies, thereby cutting himself off from the possibility of truly estimating the Atonement. He says God is the real redeemer, while Christ is only the human revealer of God's redeeming love.<sup>2</sup>

## II.

Another notable feature in the volume before us is the failure of its writers to perceive that several truths can be combined together, and that the affirmation of one is not straightway the exclusion of another. We may give a string of fallacies in argument due to the oversight here stigmatized. Because there is enough actual, personal sin in the world to call for a Redeemer, there is no need to suppose a fall of Adam as head of the race. Because the love of God sent Christ to redeem us, Christ had nothing to do in the way of placating God, of making satisfaction to Him, of answering a claim made by His justice. Because God is immutable love, He had not to be conciliated towards the sinner. It was the obedience of Christ that was valuable, and therefore His death in itself had no value. The Crucifixion was a crime, not therefore precious in God's sight. Jesus being a prophet was not a priest; hence He atoned by the offering of no sacrifice, and the contrary opinion was an error due to the application of Jewish notions to Christian truth. It is derogatory to God to suppose that any man, even the man Jesus Christ, has a claim against

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 122, 123. Author's own italics.

<sup>2</sup> "God is the redeemer, Jesus Christ the reconciler." (p. 123.) "Jesus revealed unto us God as eternal love." (p. 122.)

God because of a debt paid, for God can be subject to no claim. St. Anselm's idea of honour restored was borrowed from chivalry, and therefore is not theological; for a like reason forensic theories borrowed from the law courts have no application in the ethical order of redemption. The parable of the Prodigal Son shows the true nature of God's forgiveness; but it represents forgiveness without any debt paid, and therefore there is no such payment. To prolong the list would be useless; it is already sufficiently extended to serve its purpose of illustration.

In conclusion, we may say that the volume before us may furnish to the Catholic reader a number of useful thoughts which he may embody, often not without adaptation, into his own system; but the theology as a whole he cannot accept, not only because it consists of self-contradictory parts, but also because many of these parts in themselves are erroneous. As a single specimen of a passage which may be read in a useful light, let us take what Harnack says:<sup>1</sup>

Those who profess to find in themselves no need for redemption either deceive themselves or they are thinking of only one particular kind. The need is a universal one. I do not mean the common desire for the bettering of one's own position, but rather that deeper feeling—the wish to be freed from the life that surrounds us, and to win a new and higher existence. We have only to open our eyes to see hundreds of redeemers offering themselves and promising redemption to the eager multitudes who surround them. There are devilish redeemers like intoxication and wild voluptuousness. Redemption is promised by art and science to their votaries. There are those who put their trust in writers, poets, and philosophers, and announce that they have found through them the way of redemption. The world is full of prophets and messiahs—they are, of course, no longer called so. But that which they will not let die, that which they always reawaken, is a noble aspiring. Everywhere amongst men is the desire to soar above the stream of the commonplace; they will not remain submerged in it for ever and lost; they yearn ceaselessly for deliverance from their servitude into a nobler form of life. But the longing after redemption may be more definitely described. Wherever the Christian religion has come, wherever the faintest beam of it has been kindled, the idea gains possession of the soul that righteousness is the highest good and that guilt is the deepest evil. To be pure and to possess inward peace, that is the longing of longings. . . . The real theme of history for nearly two

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 110—115.



thousand years has been the struggle between belief and unbelief, the battle for God and for redemption. Mankind is wrestling, aided by the powers of the moral and holy, to be freed from the service of transitory things. There are some modern writers who would persuade us that this is an illusion, and that the theme of the world's history is still the struggle to possess that which is of the earth earthly. This is a mistake. If it were necessary there are thousands and thousands who would relinquish all their earthly possessions, who for the sake of an ideal, even an erroneous ideal, would part with life itself. They know of a higher existence than that of sensual life, and they struggle towards it. If this be true, we have at once the conception of redemption. In the highest sense redemption can only be the power which helps us to a holy, pure life, and strengthens the conviction within us that the boon is not a mere variety of earthly existence, but a new and abiding life.

JOHN RICKABY.

### *The Sinclair Expedition to Norway.*

---

SOME years ago, when on a walking tour from Christiania to Trondhjem, it was my fortune to pass a night at Toftemoen, a hamlet at the foot of the Dovrejelds, which rose frowning ahead of us. The station or posting-house was kept by a certain Tofte, who claimed to be descended, and, we believe, with reason, from the early Norwegian Kings, and it was his boast that he could trace his descent from Harold Harfager himself. Indeed, in a quaintly drawn family tree, which we found in the guest-room, it was clear that the Tofte pedigree did not even stop at Harold the fair-haired, but went back to Thor and Odin or some such mythological and misty personages.

During my stay I paid a visit to a brother of Tofte's, who occupied a large holding a mile or two away on the mountain slopes, and which from its wealth of horses and cattle ranked as one of the most noteworthy farms on the Gulbrandsdal. The proprietor received us with a truly Northern hospitality, and when we had drunk "Skoal gamle Norge" (Health to old Norway), he showed us some of the treasures in his state apartment. It was an enormous room, measuring some forty feet by thirty, the roof supported in the middle by a wooden pillar. Along one side ran an immense side-board (skarp) which rose as high as the ceiling, and was resplendent with gilt and paint. The name of its owner and the date of construction, some time in the early eighteenth century, were emblazoned in flaming letters upon it, and an opening in the centre admitted light through one of the windows. I was much struck by three panels on the walls, painted in oils, not, it must be confessed, in the highest style of art, representing the arrival, march, and annihilation of what the Norwegians call the "Sinclair Expedition."

It is one of the few instances in which our history and that of Norway commingles in these later centuries, and as it was an occasion on which for once in the way fortune frowned upon

us, we have managed to forget it. Not so the Norwegians. The defeat and death of Sinclair is one of their deeply-cherished traditions, and the most popular song in the language is Storm's spirited ballad, "Sinklar's visen," that every Gulbrandsdaler knows by heart, and which, in simple yet stirring verse, recounts the setting forth from fair Scotland of Herr Sinklar, his march through Norway, and his surprise and death at the hands of the Gulbrandsdal farmers.

It was in the days, to quote Dugald Dalgetty, of the great lion of the North, Gustavus Adolphus, who, for a Protestant hero, had a happy knack of letting his co-religionists feel the weight of his arm equally with his Catholic opponents.

He was at war with the Danes, who then ruled over Norway. Getting somewhat the worst of it, and Stockholm being threatened with siege, he determined to raise a body of troops in Scotland, who were to make a diversion in his favour by marching across Norway (the Danes having closed the sea route) to the relief of his capital.

The Danes at this time had no less than eighteen thousand English, French, and German mercenaries in their service, which told heavily against Gustavus, who on his side had only one foreign regiment of eight or nine companies to assist him. And so in November, 1611, he commissioned Sir James Spens, of Wormiston, a Scottish officer who stood high in his regard, "to levy and hasten his return with three thousand soldiers of proved faithfulness and bravery."

The task, however, allotted to his emissary was not as easy as it appeared. It is true at that time in Scotland there was a large class of men to whom foreign service offered an irresistible attraction. Owing to the recent Union, many of the sons of the gentry and better classes, whose trade had been war, were deprived of their employment, and ready for any adventure. But there was one fatal bar. It must be remembered that James I. was brother-in-law to Christian of Denmark, with whom besides he was on terms of intimate friendship, and weak as was James' nature, it will be seen that he acted loyally up to the duties of his relationship.

It is not very clear from the existing documents, whether Spens went personally to Scotland to superintend the raising of the levies. Probably not. Gustavus had urged in his commission that he should land them at Elfsborg in the Sound, as early as the 1st April, 1612, and that he should co-operate with a

certain Mönnichofen, whom the King styles his truly beloved general, who was to bring a thousand infantry to the same port about the same time. But the execution of this part of the plan was rendered impossible by the fall of Elfsborg, the Danes thus obtaining the command of the sea.

So early as the beginning of June, 1612, Sir Robert Anstruther, the British Ambassador in Denmark, writes to King James detailing complaints of many piratical attacks by Scottish ships that had been made on Norwegian harbours, and which, in spite of his, Anstruther's, protests, were believed by the Danes to have been instigated and set on foot by Sir James Spens.

As far as we can judge from the evidence, Spens' agent was Colonel Andrew Ramsay, and it was he who became the active organizer of the Scottish levies. It was not an unwise choice, for he was of the Ramsays of that ilk who just then stood in high favour at Court. One of the brothers, John, had as a royal page done the King yeoman's service in saving him from death in the Gowrie Conspiracy, and after his master had come to the English throne, he became one of his most influential courtiers. There is no doubt that Colonel Ramsay made an unscrupulous use of the royal name in his recruiting proceedings, but they were kept so far secret that the King did not apparently get word of the matter until too late to make any effective protest. On the last day of July, 1612, the King wrote to his Scottish Privy Council that, "whereas it is said there is a colonel and certain captains levying men there to go to Sweden, we wonder that any subject of ours dare presume in that kind to serve any foreign prince, not only without our licence, but directly against our meaning and special promise made to our dear brother the King of Denmark. It is therefore our pleasure that ye certify as to what that levying of soldiers meaneth; by what authority it is done; and that ye make stay of all proceedings therein till ye shall be advertised of our further pleasure concerning that matter."

In compliance with these peremptory orders of the King, the Scottish Privy Council at once issued a proclamation, dated the 4th August, 1612, in which the enlisting and transporting of soldiers to Sweden was forbidden, and two Acts were passed, the one accusing "Captains Hay, Ker, and Sinclair" of having enlisted men for the wars of Sweden, and ordering them to desist from their enterprize, &c.; the other summoning Colonel

Andrew Ramsay to appear before the Council to "hear and see his Majesty's will, pleasure, and direction," in respect of the men of war enlisted under his pay and command, to be transported to Sweden. The following day, the Lord of the Council ordered officers of arms "to pass, command, and charge the masters, owners, skippers, and mariners of ships and vessels freighted for transport of soldiers to Sweden, that they bring in their ships to the harbour of Leith, and there suffer them to lie, and not to set sail, until they know the Council's will and pleasure towards them, under pain of being denounced as rebels and "put to the horn."<sup>1</sup> We are left to guess what the result of this proclamation was, but we suspect that in those days of difficult communication in such a country as Scotland, it would have but little effect.

On the 15th of August another and more forcibly worded Act was issued by the Council, ordering that the companies of men lately enlisted under the charge and commandment of Colonel Ramsay and some other captains for the wars of Sweden, be broken up, and that they shall in no wise be transported to Sweden, and they ordained by another Act of the same date that the companies under Colonel Ramsay, who had in the meanwhile professed his willingness to render obedience to the King by disbanding them, should be landed, one half at Leith, the other half at Burnt Island, on the other side of the Forth.

But they had first to catch their hare. Ramsay was a man who did not stick at trifles, and it probably cost him but little to give his word to surrender his force to the Scottish Council—a promise he had not the slightest intention of keeping. It had, however, the effect of lulling the suspicions of the authorities just at the critical moment and of putting a stop to further action on their part till it was too late.

We get from these various facts and proclamations a very striking picture of the ways of recruiting-sergeants in the seventeenth century, and of the more than doubtful devices adopted to fill their ranks. They were not by any means particular from where the supplies of men were derived. Captain Ker, one of the enlistsers, makes use of his kinsman's, Sir Robert Ker of Ancrum's, good offices. This powerful

<sup>1</sup> In Scottish law a declaration of outlawry, after three blasts of a horn, and the putting up of a citation at the quay, pier, or shore in Leith, or at the market-cross in Edinburgh.

Border noble apprehended, says the quaint chronicle, "in the middle schyres a number of malefactors, whereof some were executed, some set at liberty upon caution, and some sent to Sweden." In other parts of the country they adopted the fashion of the modern pressgang. It was asserted "that they have violently pressed and taken a great many honest men's sons, and have carried them to the ships against their wills, of purpose to transport them to Sweden. They go about the country in a swaggering manner, awaiting the time and occasion when they may apprehend any persons travelling on their lawful adois (business), and if they be master of them they immediately lay hands on them, and by force and violence convey them to the next shore, where they have their boats in readiness to take them on board of their ships. And divers young fellows who were resolved to have come to these parts to have awaited upon the harvests, and cutting down of the corn, are for those reasons afraid to come here."

The Council had summoned Ramsay for the 18th of September. They were doubtless under the impression that their action had prevented the levying and despatch of troops, but it was only one more instance of shutting the stable door when the steed had been stolen.

Probably these measures of repression had some effect in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh and the more civilized districts, but in the Highlands, where the King's writ ran in a very modified degree, if at all, the proclamations were so much waste-paper. The exact date of the sailing of the Expedition from Scotland is not known, but as it arrived on the Norwegian coast on the 19th or 20th August, 1612, it was probably about the middle of the month. One of the ships, with Alexander Ramsay in command, a brother of Andrew (who disappears henceforward from the scene), set sail from Dundee, and the other, under the charge of Sinclair, from Caithness.

This Captain George Sinclair, whose name has been given to the Expedition, was an illegitimate scion of the great house of Caithness, and seems to have been an unscrupulous soldier of fortune, ready for any doubtful work that promised pay or plunder. He was employed by the Earl of Caithness, in the intervals of his recruiting, in aiding in the perpetration of as black a piece of villainy as stains even Scottish annals. A certain Lord Maxwell had been banished the realm for the



murder of the Laird of Johnstone, but returning into Scotland in the spring of 1612 he sought and received the hospitality of his friend, the Earl of Caithness, whose Countess was Lord Maxwell's cousin. In the hope of obtaining a reward from the King, and favour from the Court and Privy Council, this treacherous Earl, with the aid of Captain George Sinclair, delivered his guest to the Council, and he was hanged at Edinburgh in the following year. It is pleasant to read that the Earl of Caithness never obtained his expected reward, and that Captain Sinclair came to his deserved end among the hills of Norway.

We have seen that Gustavus Adolphus, with that military prescience that he showed even in his earliest years, had intended that the Scottish Expedition should combine with that of Mönnichofen (*Scottice*, Menigowe), a Fleming, who had raised a thousand men in Holland, and was to have joined forces in the Orkneys. But when the time came this idea was abandoned. Probably Mönnichofen's preparations were more advanced than those of his Scotch allies, for we know that as early as the 1st June, 1612, his troops were ready to embark, and although they were detained for five weeks by contrary winds, he sailed at last on the 14th July, a month before the Scotch Expedition, from Amsterdam, and landed five days later in Stor Dalen, above Trondhjem, the then capital of Norway. How he succeeded in his task of marching across to Stockholm it is not our purpose here to detail. He met with but small opposition from the poorly-armed peasants, his principal difficulties being the lack of provisions, and his progress was comparatively an easy one. Gustavus led in person the newly-arrived force to the attack of the Danish position, and its opportune arrival did much to bring the war to an end.

Not so successful was to be the course of the smaller Scottish Expedition. Its fate was to be a far more tragic one. The opening of Storm's ballad tells us how

Herr Sinclair sailed across the sea,  
And steered his course to Norway's strand;  
Mid Gudbrand's rocks his grave found he,  
There were broken crowns in Sinclair's band.

It is in the scanty native records of the period that we must look for our knowledge of the after history of this band of Scots, who were "to discover to their cost how dangerous it was to attack those who live among the Norwegian mountains."

There exists, in addition, a mass of romantic details embodied in the Sagas of the district. As Scott has said of Flodden,

Tradition, legend, tune and song,  
Shall many an age that wail prolong.

And so all these elements go to make up for us the story of the tragedy of the Sinclair Expedition, in default of more reliable historical documents.

The Romsdal Fiord, where Sinclair and his ill-fated force landed, is one of the grandest of the many inlets by which the Norwegian coast is indented. It is surrounded on all sides by imposing mountain ranges. Immediately inland are the Troltinderne (Witches' peaks), their summits broken up into fantastic shapes, with the Romsdalshorn Peak towering above all. The Romsdal, which runs southward for some thirty miles, is the most picturesque of Norsk valleys, and now-a-days one of the best known to our countrymen. At times it contracts to a narrow pass, and down the mountain-sides many a waterfall fed by the snow-fields above comes rushing down to feed the Rauma's stream.

A painting by two of Norway's best artists represents for us Colonel Sinclair's landing. It follows the legendary belief as to the cruel behaviour of the Scots, and so we see the natives being plundered and ill-treated, while a clergyman in the garb of a Calvinistic minister is engaged in the most unclerical task of abducting a fair Norwegian maiden; but all this is proved by official records as contrary to the received evidence. The first aim of the Scots was to secure a guide for the march. A certain Peder Klognaes, taking them for peaceable merchants, rowed out to them to buy corn, but was promptly impressed as pilot and guide. In spite, however, of their strict guard he managed to send off a budstikke (message), warning the people of the arrival of an enemy and calling them to arms. Peder was a thorough patriot. He did all in his power to retard the progress of his captors, and led them many a mile out of their way, over marsh and mountain, thereby giving time to his countrymen to save their property and themselves, and to send on the "fiery cross" through the land. But little is told us of the first part of the Scottish march. They followed the valley road, easy and uninterrupted. No preparations for defence had been made, for the Romsdal men lacked arms and leaders. One thing alone is chronicled by every Saga, and that is the cruelty

of the invaders. Lust, rapine, and arson, according to every testimony marked their path, and the instances are set down with a detail of circumstance and plan that in spite of the contrary evidence almost enforces conviction. War in those days was not waged with rose-water, as Drogheda and Magdeburg could testify, and a band of wild Highlanders would not have been the pleasantest visitors in the world for a valley of peaceful peasants. We must, however, give the Scots the benefit of the doubt. It is evident that the Sagas, the local papers of the period, thoroughly understood the art of embellishing their press accounts, and the seventeenth century was not a whit behind the twentieth in drawing on its imagination for its facts.

Two or three days' march brought them to the head of the Romsdal Valley, whence a rocky pass of no great difficulty led over into the Gulbrandsdal, a thickly-populated valley. Unopposed as their progress had been, they might begin to flatter themselves that their further way was easy, and it is recorded that hereabouts they held a feast in a barn still standing in 1836, and indulged in dancing to celebrate their fancied triumph. But they reckoned without their host. The regular troops of the country-side had all gone to the Danish war, and there remained only the farmers of the valley to oppose the Scots. But these were imbued with a stern, patriotic spirit, and the leaders men of energy and resource. Laurentz Hage, the Lensmand or peace-officer of the district, at once roused the Bonder of the neighbourhood and sent on the fiery cross to the more populous parts of the valley. It is related that he came into Dovre church during Divine Service, told them of the arrival of the enemy, and called the congregation to arms. With what force he could collect at so short a notice, he hastened to meet the Scots, and made his first halt on the cliff road in the gorge of Rusten, a little to the north of the modern station of Laurgaard, well known to travellers in Norway. Judging from our own knowledge of the pass, the position must have been eminently defensible, and so in hot haste they began to throw up breastworks, but before they could be completed the enemy came in sight, and the result of a war-council was that the Bonder abandoned the post and retreated farther south, first destroying the bridge of Rusten, and thereby forcing the Scots to take to the fjeld. It was perhaps a wise movement. The numbers of the peasants were being rapidly swollen from

the adjoining parishes, and in a short time a force of from four to five hundred men were gathered together. A monster carouse was the first result. Round the barrels of öl (ale) they passed the night, singing and making merry much as our Saxon forefathers did before Hastings. Luckily, when the Scottish vanguard appeared, the barrels were running dry, and there was no reason to loiter, or possibly their love of liquor would have proved even stronger than their fear of the Scots. And so they hurried off again as far as Kringelen, where they made their final stand.

At this point the narrow bridle-path, then the only high-road of the country, ran along the edge of the cliff high above the Laagen River. It was a narrow, precipitous track, hardly wide enough for three men abreast. Overhead the sides were thickly wooded, and under its cover the Norwegians had prepared a deadly trap, unseen even by the keen eyes of their Highland foes.

High above the road were raised huge breastworks, supporting piles of rock and timber which were laid on projecting logs held together by ropes and props, so arranged that when the ropes were cut and the props removed, the whole mass would crash down the hill-slope on to the enemy beneath. This was not a new device in Norwegian warfare, for we find a similar instance in Kong Sverre's Saga, ch. 18. The whole of the awful barricade was concealed by branches of trees, so as to give the natural appearance of a wood, and we may imagine the defenders too, like a second Birnam Wood, encased in green boughs.

The main force of the Bonder was ambushed at this spot, but a smaller body of them was detached a little to the north for the purpose of cutting off the escape of the Scots should they attempt to fall back. *Chevaux de frise* of tree trunks were also prepared on either flank to roll down into the road and prevent their escape from the fatal trap. On an island in the Laagen, which ran alongside the road, were stationed peasants with the task of deceiving the Scots by a feint attack and so drawing off their attention. So carefully were the Bonder hidden in their wooded lair, that it was not easy for them to know when the Scots should pass beneath their ambushade. An ingenious plan obviated this difficulty. On the island, directly in a line with the vanguard of the invaders, rode a man on a white horse, just out of gunshot, who halted when they

halted, moved on when they advanced, and enabled the peasants without showing themselves to know to a moment when the time to cut all adrift had arrived. On reaching the appointed spot he gave the final warning by turning suddenly round. Nor did this close the Norwegian list of precautions. On an opposite eminence across the river, one of the best musicians of the valley, a maiden named Ragnhild Guri, was posted with her mountain horn (*Luur*), to attract the attention of the Scots and to signal their advance to her friends in hiding.

All this scientific angling could but have one result. The unsuspecting fish rushed blindly into the net. Seeing no enemy in front of them and unheeding the attack from the island, the marksmen on which were quite out of range, the Scots marched gallantly on, with their pipes playing. As the strains of the distant horn reached them, they halted and listened to the fair player, and the bagpipes answered her with the *Sinclair March*. Then the signal was given to cut all loose, and in an instant the scene was changed. The awful avalanche of rocks and timber crashed down on their devoted heads, and at the same instant a storm of shot swept through their closely packed ranks, *Sinclair* falling at the first volley and leaving his men leaderless and disordered. Then the *Bonder* poured down from the heights and attacked their broken enemy with fury. Crowded into the narrow pass and unable to use their weapons to advantage, they were an easy prey to assailants flushed with victory and thoroughly acquainted with the ground. Yet even then, taken at so great a disadvantage, the Scots were worthy of their high renown and did not fall without a struggle. The *Sagas* do full justice to their valour. They tell how the Scots attempted to scale the heights in order to come to close quarters. As an older ballad than *Storm's* has it:

They tried to climb the mountain steep,  
The Norsemen death to deal;  
But from the rocks were forced to leap  
By logs and stones and steel.

"For an hour and a half," says the official report, "this unequal contest lasted, and those who were not crushed and shot, jumped into the river and were swept away by its stream, the few who swam to the other bank being killed by the *Bonder* on that side." In the meantime the advance guard of the Scots, who had passed unscathed, tried to escape on seeing the slaughter of their companions, but they were pursued and

overtaken by the Bonders, and eventually over a hundred of them threw down their arms and surrendered. Among the prisoners were three officers, one of them a brother of that Andrew Ramsay who superintended the enlistment, and they were all put into a barn for the night, whilst their fate was being deliberated upon. The leaders, as men responsible to authority, were in favour of sending them to the head-quarters at Agershuus; but the peasants, furious and exasperated, clamoured for the last penalty, and taking them out one by one they shot and stabbed them to death, with the exception of the officers and fifteen men; some of whom, with the true spirit of free-lances, enlisted at once in the Danish army. Krussze reports to the Government, that with the carefulness that still characterizes the Norwegian peasants, "They said to each other that his Royal Majesty had enough to feed, in those same eighteen."

It is difficult, even in those days of cruel warfare, to palliate, much less to justify, the massacre of the Scots. It was not that the Bonder had suffered heavy loss at their hands in the recent battle, for the Sagas say definitely that only

Six of them were killed  
In the battle on the cliff.

Many reasons have been advanced to excuse this deed of blood. It is not improbable that they were excited by the reported outrages committed by the Scots on their march. Then, on the night following the combat, they were sure to have feasted and drunk deeply to celebrate their victory, when the worst features of their nature would prevail. It is said, too, that they were tired of the continual marching, and that this being the busy time of harvest they could spare no men to serve as a necessary guard to the prisoners. And so they were sacrificed.

Not one alone, but several monuments still testify to the pride the Norwegians felt in their exploit. They are all of modern construction and of primitive character. That above Sinclair's grave is at Quam, twelve miles away from the battle-field. He was buried outside the churchyard, as he was not permitted to lie in consecrated ground. Quite a contest arose as to which parish should possess his body, and it is still told that his remains were left unburied for several days, in order to satisfy the curiosity of the peasants who flocked in crowds



to gaze on their dead enemy. The stone that marks his resting-place is a rough-hewn slab with a cross rudely cut upon it, and beneath, the inscription: "Here was buried the Scottish leader, George Sinclair, after he had fallen at Kringelen, 26 August, 1612."

One of the most touching traditions is that relating to the fate of Sinclair's wife, who, with a young child said to have been born on the voyage, accompanied the Expedition. The betrothed of a Norwegian maiden, to whom he was to have been married next day, was persuaded by her to absent himself from the fight; but when she heard that Mrs. Sinclair was with her husband and that she carried a new-born babe, her woman's heart was touched, and she sent her lover to save, if possible, the mother and child. In the tumult of the fight he approached them. The little one had been just hit by a ball and the mother on horseback was binding up its wound. As he drew near, frantic with grief as she was at the loss of those dearest to her, Mrs. Sinclair doubtless mistook his intention, and pulling out a pistol shot him dead. Accounts differ as to her after fate. The most poetic is that which describes her thrown into the Laagen by the peasants and chanting a wild coronach of despair over her lost ones, ere she sank beneath its waters.

Of the Scots who remained alive, "some of them," says the official report, "took service straightway among the good folk in the country." There must have been some handicraftsmen among them, for we hear of one who, after working on the land, afterwards settled down in Oslo as a goldsmith, and sent his old master a silver cup as a remembrance. Another was a glazier with some artistic taste, for one of his windows with a crest and figure of an angel, from a farm in Vaage, is now in the Anglican Church, Christiania.

The three surviving officers, Alexander Ramsay, James Money Penny, and Henry Bruce, were sent to Copenhagen and examined by King Christian himself. Alexander in his answer naturally throws all the blame upon his brother—*Les absents ont toujours tort*. He relied on Andrew's word implicitly, and declared that those things that were done were with the knowledge and approval of his Majesty of Great Britain. To counteract the effect of this statement on the suspicious mind of Christian, and which James was afraid would put him into his brother-in-law's bad graces, six weeks later Andrew Ramsay is questioned before the Scottish Council at Edinburgh.

Probably knowing what is expected of him, he hastens to assure the examiners with all humility, that King James was never acquainted with his doings, and that he had no leave or commission, directly or indirectly, from the King. He furthermore declared in answer to the Council, that neither they nor any other officers of the King did encourage them.

And so all the actors in the drama we have sketched pass from the scene, and like every other vestige of our frail humanity, leave but a handful of old world traditions and a mouldering gravestone, to point the moral of the tale.

'Mid Norway's mountains still there stands  
A column raised upon the spot:  
Let Norway's foes from other lands,  
Behold it and despise it not:  
No Norskman sees it rise on high  
But marks it with a flashing eye.

J. S. SHEPARD.

## *Flotsam ana Jetsam.*

---

### **History, Glorified—or Degraded?**

THE sumptuous volumes dealing with the reigns of the more notable amongst our monarchs, which are being issued by MM. Goupil, and wherein the resources of French art are pressed into our service, would seem to afford ample evidence that the people of England duly estimate the value of their national story, for is it not impossible that there should be any carelessness or indifference as to the character of a treasure for which so costly a casket is provided?

At the same time other considerations must needs present themselves, suggesting questions not altogether reassuring. Is it altogether a good thing that, within her own domain, the muse of History should be found playing second to her sister of Art, as is undoubtedly the case here? It is manifestly the illustrations which furnish the *raison d'être* of these publications, the letter-press owing its existence to the need of a frame in which the beautiful plates may appropriately be set. And here at once appears a grave danger. It is not in human nature to produce a splendid book in which a Sovereign is the central figure, and then to deal out in his regard rigorous historical justice, with the possible effect of showing him to have been a poor specimen of humanity, by no means worthy of such a monument. It is almost inevitable that the task of writing about him should be committed to some one who starts with a disposition to write him up, and to impart to his portrait something of an heroic cast. Moreover, in such circumstances, the history has to be presented in a form which is not congenial to sound work. The fair pages of an *édition de luxe* must not be encumbered with notes and references and the other disfigurements of serious labour. The writer must speak *ex cathedra*, telling his tale as though there were none other possible, while of those who read, it is more than probable that the majority starts with the assumption that what comes to

them in so imposing a guise, needs no other guarantee to compel acceptance.

Such are some of the reflections which suggest themselves on a perusal of the latest volume of the series in question, "*Henry VIII.*, by A. F. Pollard, M.A., late Assistant Editor of the *Dictionary of National Biography*." A wonderful piece of work it surely is, which did we not find it thus actually in being, we should have thought it impossible that any one should at this time of day produce, expecting to be taken seriously. Bluff King Hal is presented to us not only as the most notable ruler England ever had, but as a pattern whom others would have done well to copy. Though he had his blemishes, yet as a ruler he was on the side of the angels, and as a man his was, we are assured, a fine and noble character, and he has suffered much wrong at the hands of prejudiced writers. Such a view, if not altogether new, is undoubtedly unusual, and might be supposed to have ended, as it began, with Mr. Froude. It is doubtless eminently suitable for the purpose for which it is now required, but of its intrinsic value we must judge by testing a few samples.

Of the religious revolution effected by the King when Gospel light began to beam on him through Boleyn's eyes, we read amongst other items the following:<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile a vigorous assault was made on the strongholds of superstition; pilgrimages were suppressed, and many wonder-working images were pulled down and destroyed. The famous Rood of Boxley, a figure whose contortions had once imposed upon the people, was taken to the market-place at Maidstone, and the ingenious mechanism, whereby the eyes and lips miraculously opened and shut, was exhibited to the vulgar gaze.

Thus can history be written in this year of grace 1902 by a writer who claims a position such as Mr. Pollard's, but nevertheless is not ashamed to repeat a story, the absurdity of which would be its sufficient refutation, even had it not been shown to be a fable. It is now several years since the late Father Bridgett wrote his pamphlet, *The Rood of Boxley, or how a lie grows*, in which, carefully examining all available evidence, he made it clear that there never was any deception about the famous Rood, that none had ever been attempted, or was even possible. His conclusion will, if we mistake not, amply commend itself to any one who takes the trouble to examine

<sup>1</sup> P. 251.

the evidence adduced, as it has satisfied so high an authority as Mr. James Gairdner, who, accepting Father Bridgett's exposure of the legend,<sup>1</sup> speaks of the Rood with its strings and hinges as at worst an "old-fashioned toy,"<sup>2</sup> which having once suited a childish popular taste had long been out of use and of repair.

Moreover, Mr. Pollard's statement that "many" wonder-working images were destroyed at the same time is a mere empty flourish signifying nothing, which has been borrowed from the same untrustworthy sources as the legend itself. Father Bridgett shows that the Rood of Boxley was the one stock instance of a wonder-working image even alleged by any contemporary, and that it grew into a multitude only through the vague rhetoric of subsequent writers, and the uncritical practice of historians, "who merely transcribed from printed books, with various arrangement and more or less skill, but without any independent examination of evidence." Such a mode of composing history would appear to be yet not extinct, in spite of the observation which follows the words just quoted. "Of late years history is supposed to have become a science as well as an art. Historians profess to sift carefully their facts and to go to original sources."

From an inanimate victim of the King's reforming zeal we turn to the most illustrious of those who paid with their life for venturing to have an opinion as to their own conduct. It is thus that Mr. Pollard pronounces judgment upon Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More, who preferred to die rather than accept the King as Head of the Church.<sup>3</sup> The italics are ours.

Condemned justly or not by the law, both sought their death in a quarrel which is as old as the hills and will last till the crack of doom. Where shall we place the limits of conscience, and where those of the national will? Is conscience a luxury which only a King may enjoy in peace? Fisher and More refused to accommodate theirs to Acts of Parliament, *but neither believed conscience to be the supreme tribunal.* More admitted that in temporal matters his conscience was bound by the laws of England, in spiritual matters the conscience of all was bound by the will of Christendom, *and on that ground* both Fisher and he rejected the plea of conscience when urged by the heretics they condemned to the flames. . . . Fisher and More protested by their death against a principle which they had practised in life.

<sup>1</sup> *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.* vol. xiii. Preface, pp. viii.—x.

<sup>2</sup> *History of the English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 199.

<sup>3</sup> P. 225.

Such a verdict will assuredly startle readers who know anything of those upon whom it is passed. What possible ground, it will be asked, has Mr. Pollard for assertions so astounding? Upon what does he base his paradox that men whom none ever denied to have died for conscience' sake alone did not in truth acknowledge the claims of conscience? There seems to be no doubt, though it might well appear incredible, that he deduces his judgment from a well-known reply of More's to an argument urged by his judges, the whole point of which was to vindicate the obligation he was under of acting according to his conscience, irrespective of every other consideration. We enjoy the advantage of having the position he took up clearly explained by himself in his letter to his daughter, Margaret Roper, describing his trial.

He had told the court that while for his own part he must decline the oath of Royal Supremacy, he would not condemn the consciences of those who felt themselves at liberty to take it. Thereupon Cranmer, who was one of the judges, interrupted him with the objection that if this were so, he could not be sure that his own judgment was right, in which case it was his duty to disregard his private scruples and comply with his Sovereign's will. To this, More wrote (*italics ours*):

I could answer nothing but only that I thought I might not well do so, because in my conscience this was one of the cases I was bound not to obey my prince, since (whatsoever other folk thought in the matter, whose conscience or learning I would not condemn) to my conscience *the truth* seemed on the other side.

Another of his judges then objected that he should distrust his own opinion in the matter, seeing that the Great Council of the realm took the opposite view.

To that I answered [he continues], that if there were no more than myself upon my side, and the whole Parliament upon the other, I would be sore afraid to lean my own mind against so many. But, on the other side, if it so be that I have, as I think I have, upon my part as great a Council, and a greater too, I am not then bounden to change my conscience and conform it to the Council of one realm against the General Council of Christendom.

Such is the material out of which Mr. Pollard can manufacture the extraordinary statement which he makes with so much confidence. From his manner of speaking, he would not



seem to suspect that in regard to conscience More held the prime factor to be *the truth*.

And what shall we say of the heretics whom Fisher and More "condemned to the flames," denying in their case the right of conscience which they claimed for themselves? What indeed? except that we have here again a vain, rhetorical flourish, as with the many wonder-working images we met with before. While we have no evidence that either Fisher or More ever condemned a single one, and strong negative evidence that they did not,<sup>1</sup> we have More's own emphatic denial, published by himself and never met with a contradiction, that he ever did anything of the kind:

Of all that ever came in my hand for heresy, as help me God, saving the sure keeping of them, had never any of them any stripe or stroke given them, so much as a fillip on the forehead.

Still more remarkable than what we have yet seen is Mr. Pollard's account of Henry VIII. himself. This much injured Sovereign, we learn, far from being a tyrant, was, on the contrary, a constitutional ruler in the best sense of the term. Allegations that his Parliaments were either packed or terrorized, "to any great extent," may, we are assured,<sup>2</sup> "be dismissed as gross exaggerations." The idea of packing and terrorizing, and the charge of servility brought against Parliament, had their origin, we are told, in "the harmony which prevailed between it and the King," a harmony created by identity of views and interests, so that "inasmuch as it was servile at all, Parliament faithfully represented its constituents." On the other hand, we read, "No monarch was ever a more zealous champion of Parliamentary privileges, nor a more scrupulous observer of Parliamentary forms. . . . He was careful to observe himself the deference to Parliamentary privilege which he exacted from others."

This, and more to the same effect, means, if it has a meaning, not only that Henry VIII. sheltered his arbitrary Government,—as undoubtedly he did,—behind the forms of Parliament, which he took care should be nothing more than forms,<sup>3</sup> but that he derived his strength from the willing support

<sup>1</sup> See Gairdner's *English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 128, seq.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 179—183.

<sup>3</sup> "Freedom of debate was indeed granted, but with a qualification which in reality amounted to a refusal. It was only a *decent* freedom: and as the King reserved to himself the right of deciding what was or what was not decent, he frequently put down the opponents of the Court by reprimanding the 'varlets' in

of a free people. So strange a notion might perhaps most fitly be left in its naked simplicity. We cannot, however, refrain from observing upon the curious persistency with which historians of the first standing, whose impartiality none will gainsay, have failed to understand so exemplary a character. It will be sufficient to cite a few, belonging to different schools, and to set the account they give beside the roseate picture presented by Mr. Pollard.

We are told by Hallam<sup>1</sup> that the Parliamentary attainders to which Henry so freely resorted to rid himself of those he found troublesome, "were violations of reason and justice in the application of law;" and that "many general enactments of this reign bear the same character of servility. New political offences were created in every Parliament, against which the severest penalties were denounced." Again, "In surrendering by the Act of Succession] the regular laws of the monarchy to one man's caprice, the Parliament became accessory, so far as in it lay, to dispositions which might eventually have kindled the flames of civil war." Mr. Hallam further tells us that the King was enabled to soar to such heights of despotism only by the aid of the "perfidious hand of Parliament," and speaks of the King's Government as "administered with so frequent violations not only of the chartered privileges of Englishmen, but of those still more sacred rights which natural law has established."

So, again, Mr. Finlason writes:<sup>2</sup>

There can be no doubt that the measures passed in the reign of Henry VIII. after the execution of Buckingham were passed under terror of the royal power. Of this there is overwhelming testimony. . . . Our author [Sir James Mackintosh] truly shows that throughout the whole of this prince's reign he seems to have enjoyed the full gratification of his will and caprice, and that a concurrence of events . . . enabled him to tyrannize over all ranks of men, and over the laws themselves, or, when that were not safe, to cause such laws to be made as would warrant and legitimate every act of power. It was the unhappy fate of the English during this age, that when they laboured under any grievance, they had not the satisfaction of expecting redress from Parliament. On the contrary, they had reason to dread the meeting person, or by sending to them a threatening message." (Lingard, *History*, vi. c. 5.) It should moreover be remembered, as the same authority is by no means alone in observing, that the Members of Parliament "were in great measure nominees of the Crown."

<sup>1</sup> *Constitutional History*, i. 33. Edit. 1854.

<sup>2</sup> Reeve's *History of the English Law*, iii. 316, note.

of the assembly, and were then sure of having tyranny converted into law, and aggravated perhaps with some circumstances which the arbitrary prince and his Ministers had not hitherto devised, or did not think proper of themselves to carry into execution. This abject servility never appeared more conspicuously than in a new Parliament which the King now assembled (1539), and which, if it had been so pleased, might have been the last that ever sat in England. But he found them too useful instruments of dominion ever to entertain thoughts of a total exclusion. (Hume, *History of England*.)

The above witnesses are, it is true, historians of the old school, but their conclusions are echoed by Mr. Gairdner, who is not only the latest authority on the same subject, but unquestionably far the most fully informed.<sup>1</sup> He has not the slightest doubt that "pressure" was put upon Parliament to induce it to adopt such measures as the suppression of the monasteries or the attainder of persons the case against whom it had not heard, still less any defence they had to offer. He is equally convinced that Parliaments were packed. Concerning that of 1539, for instance, of which we have already heard, he tells us:<sup>2</sup>

The elections were managed by Cromwell in a way to make it specially tractable; and when it met it showed itself tractable indeed."<sup>3</sup>

Neither has Mr. Gairdner any doubt as to the nature of the "despotism" which the King was allowed to establish. Of the treatment accorded to Queen Katharine of Arragon and her daughter Mary, he writes thus:

Never was England so degraded by tyranny as when the sympathy so generally felt for these royal victims did not dare to show itself by overt acts. The people, no doubt, were bound to their king, but the king was also bound to the law and the constitution: and yet there was no mode of keeping him to his obligations. For the nobles had lost their independence, the common people were powerless without a head, and the Church within the kingdom—that element of the national life which had really most freedom of spirit—was not only bound and shackled, but terrorized and unable to speak out.

In fine, this is the sketch drawn by the same hand of the net result of Henry's rule:<sup>4</sup>

The revolution effected by Henry VIII. was a thing without a parallel in history. Professing to the last a zeal for religion, which in early days was not altogether insincere, he had destroyed the autonomy of the Church, suppressed the monasteries, confiscated an enormous

<sup>1</sup> *History of the English Church in the Sixteenth Century.*

<sup>2</sup> P. 206.

<sup>3</sup> So very tractable that in the following year (1540) it attainted Cromwell himself.

<sup>4</sup> P. 163.

<sup>5</sup> P. 240.

mass of property, and hanged, beheaded, or intimidated all who looked for the restoration of the system he had broken down. . . . Notwithstanding the superabundant wealth left him by his father, which was very soon dissipated, he had ground down his people with taxes in order to strengthen himself against possible combinations abroad; he had twice been absolved by Parliament from the repayment of his loans; he had levied illegal benevolences, and, as a final step, he had debased the currency more than once.

But obviously, as was said before, it would not do to say all this of one whom a publisher delights to honour, and to say it in the very book designed as a monument to his memory. An author has accordingly to be found who thinks sufficiently well of the subject of the biography to make it match pretty well with the illustrations. There may result a very handsome book for the drawing-room table. How far it serves, as it professes to do, the cause of history is another question altogether.

---

#### **Blind Obedience in the French Army.**

\* One of the points declared by its adversaries to be most objectionable in the Institute of the Jesuits is that it demands a blind obedience from its sons. We are familiar with the fervid rhetoric which expresses horror at a doctrine so inconsistent with the rights of the individual conscience, and anticipates fearful dangers to society from the tolerance of a body of men pledged to live under the immoral system. Nor does it suffice to point out that the rules of the Jesuits make an express reservation—which even if not thus expressed might have been reasonably assumed—for the case in which the Superior's order and the subject's conscience might happen to be in conflict, and has declared that in such a case, obedience can neither be rightly given nor rightly demanded. The critic passes over the excepting clause with a majestic wave of the hand, and assures us that it is purely nugatory—though even if it were so, which it is not, it would be at least something that the subject's conscience is theoretically respected.

It is not, however, a vindication of Jesuit Obedience which we are now contemplating. We desire only to take note of the curious illustration recently afforded of the way in which those who take scandal at blind obedience, even though qualified with the excepting clause, when they find it among the Jesuits, can highly approve of an absolutely unqualified blind obedience when the Jesuits or other Catholics are the sufferers, and they

themselves the gainers by its exaction. We are referring, of course, to the case of Lieut.-Colonel de Saint-Remy, which is peculiarly in point, as the party now ruling in France was especially insistent on the immorality of its doctrine of blind obedience being a justifying cause for their campaign against the Society.

About the beginning of July, the Prefect of Morbihan applied to General Frater for a troop of horse to assist in closing the schools kept by the nuns at Lanouen. General Frater sent on the requisition to Colonel de Saint-Remy, who, however, declined to comply, saying, "I am a Christian, and will not share in an act which is contrary to my faith and to my religious sentiments." Accordingly he was placed under arrest, and was tried by a court-martial on September 5th. When he appeared before his judges the Cross of the Legion of Honour was on his breast to testify to the distinction of his thirty years of service, but there was no show of bravado in his manner. He answered, says the Reuter's telegram, in a calm voice, and, whilst admitting the facts which led to his indictment, pleaded that "he had to choose between his duty as a soldier and his conscience." "I was aware," he said, "of the terrible consequences of a refusal to obey, and I knew that I should be judged by you; but I knew also that I should have to submit to another judgment, that of God." Nor does he appear to have been precipitate in forming his determination, for according to General Frater's testimony in court, he took fourteen hours for reflection before he replied to the requisition, and the General added his "opinion that the accused had no desire to make a demonstration," and "seemed in fact to be greatly distressed at being obliged to put his religious sentiments before military discipline." Nor again was the occasion one over which a conscientious difficulty could not reasonably be felt—for it was a clear case of religious persecution in which he was required to co-operate. The authors of the brutal *Loi des Associations* may seek to disguise its real tendency by assuring us that their only object is to keep disuniting politics out of the school-room, and to secure a guarantee of teaching efficiency; the foreign correspondents of English newspapers may conspire to aid them by propagating this version of their designs among English readers; and the latter, not a few Catholics included, may be geese enough to gulp down the deception whole. But deception it is, and is seen to be by every one

who has taken the pains to follow the course of the recent movement against the Catholic schools. The studious refusal to take evidence as to the loosely formulated charges against the Religious ; the careful provision for confining the need of authorization to their case alone ; and the dexterous contrivance for alluring them into applying for it, not so much with the view of granting it, as of obtaining the means of more completely gaining possession of their moveable goods—these and similar features in the present movement, especially when construed together with the bitter anti-clericalism of the men from whom the act has emanated, and by whom it is being enforced, show beyond the possibility of doubt that the real object for which these expulsions have been undertaken, is to stamp out Catholic education from the land as the surest means of eventually de-Christianizing it. Evidently then there was a real conscientious difficulty for Colonel de Saint-Remy to face, and he faced it very nobly. What then are we to say of the conduct of his military superiors ?

<sup>1</sup> It is altogether inconceivable that an English Government should introduce or an English Parliament pass a measure for the closing of all the schools taught by monks and nuns, and the confiscation of all their possessions. But if we may make the inconceivable supposition, what would be the course taken by the military authorities if called upon to enforce the persecuting law ? It is likely enough that those in supreme command would prefer themselves to resign their commissions, rather than undertake a dirty work so repugnant alike to their consciences as Christians and their honour as gentlemen. But, if they could bring themselves to carry out the base orders of the Executive, of one thing at least we may be certain—they would show a delicate regard for the feelings of their subordinates, and would avoid entrusting the work to a Catholic officer or soldier whose conscience they knew would be violated by it. And in so doing, they would have been following the self-same law of right feeling which governs the Jesuit Superior in relation to his subjects, and governs every right-minded man in his dealings with those under his authority. Very different, however, has been the conduct of the French Executive. The Public Prosecutor said, "The conduct of the accused was inexcusable. Personal feelings must be sacrificed to military discipline, obligations of obedience being supreme for both great and small. The 'thinking bayonet' theory was inad-



missible." There in a nutshell unblushingly defended is the theory of unqualified blind obedience which the Jesuits are falsely accused of holding, and are denounced as immoral for holding. Let us not blame the Public Prosecutor, who perhaps was only speaking to his brief, but his revolting doctrine proves to be that of the French Ministry, and it is instructive to note the indecent readiness with which they have given it effect. We have reflected how an English Executive would have acted in like circumstances, and the same mind appears to have been in those who formed the court-martial. Evidently they thought the occasion should not have been created, and perhaps (for we cannot judge of the technicalities) they thought that, as it had been created, it would be best to strain a few technicalities so as to reduce the evil consequences as far as possible. At all events, they had left an easy and respectable escape for the Ministers, by deciding that no military order had been disregarded because none was given, and found extenuating circumstances in the refusal to accede to the demand of the civil authorities. The Ministers might have announced that the legal judges had heard and judged the case, and though they disagreed with the sentence they would respect it as in duty bound. Such a course, however, would have been quite alien to their nature. It is a monstrous thing to override the legally published judgment of a court-martial, and inflict on the accused person a severer punishment than that which he has received from the court; and still more monstrous when the severer sentence is inflicted by a mere administrative decree, without a new hearing of any kind. If such a thing were attempted by the English War Office it would rouse the whole country, and yet this is what the French Government has done, and done too with such indecent haste, that to the surprise of all, they did not wait even till the return of the Minister of War from the provinces. Nor is that all, if the *Standard* Paris correspondent is to be believed, for this gentleman reports (see *Standard* for September 10th) that the Minister of War is very displeased with General Frater for not having given stronger evidence, and intends to displace him from his command. In other words, not even when appearing as a witness is a French officer to respect his conscience and attest what he believes to be the truth, but he must say only what will further the anti-clerical dislikes of his military chief.

After all, it is not surprising that French anti-clericals should show contempt for the rights of conscience and the rules of equity when an opportunity offers for oppressing a good Catholic: "for 'tis their nature to." But what is of special interest in the recent occurrence is that at last they have incurred the censure of the English press, which so far had backed them through thick and thin. The *Globe*, indeed, still continues in its blind partisanship, and whilst dissociating itself in a half-and-half way from sympathy with the closing of the nuns' schools, has no better term than "flagrant insubordination" with which to describe Colonel de Saint-Remy's noble conduct, and highly applauds the Government for "promptly crushing the pretensions of the militarists." Evidently the *Globe* writer does not feel much respect for the rights of the individual conscience. On the other hand, whilst several of our dailies have passed a silent vote of disapproval on the action of the French Government, the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *Times* have left little to desire in their exposure of its impropriety. The Paris correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, on September 9th, thought that the condemned officer's "convictions were perfectly understandable by the right-thinking," and the *Pall Mall Gazette* itself on the following day recognized that to add by a ministerial decree to the punishment awarded by a court-martial, "looks like (indeed is) visiting a man with judgment for an offence for which he has already suffered the penalty;" and declared that it was impossible that "a Government which manages its affairs in a manner so contrary to reason and subversive of justice, should continue to have the respect of the country and the army." And the *Times*, in its leader of September 10th, whilst quoting with approval from the *Debats* an acknowledgment that Colonel de Saint-Remy's "attitude upon his trial was simple, loyal, and dignified," points out that the judgment of the court-martial was by no means unintelligible. The Prefect had sent the requisition to General Frater instead of sending it direct to Colonel de Saint-Remy, and General Frater had merely passed it on to Colonel de Saint-Remy, who considered, and apparently on substantial grounds, that the General had not the power to order him. Thus it was questionable if Colonel de Saint-Remy had ever received the order for disobeying which he is retired, and about to be removed by the Ministry. But the *Times* in the same leader has also a paragraph on the general subject of the obedience due from

a soldier to his military superior which is admirably expressed, and says exactly what Jesuit writers say, and are censured for saying, about blind obedience.

It seems idle to deny that conditions are conceivable in which it would be not merely the right, but the legal and moral duty, of a soldier to disobey orders, either civil or military, which he might receive. At the same time, the consequences of military insubordination may be so terrible and so far-reaching that in cases in which disobedience can be deemed justifiable, or even pardonable, must be excessively rare. The soldier, of whatever rank, who takes it upon himself to disobey, and still more the soldier who takes it upon himself to set the example of disobedience, assumes an awful responsibility. The absolute obedience of the soldier is a principle which, like most principles, admits of exceptions, but it is a principle without which, as the *Debats* says, there is no army, and "without an army there would soon be no public order, no nation, no fatherland." The use the Socialists are making of the judgment of the court-martial indicates very plainly the dangers inseparable from any relaxation of this doctrine. The presumption is always against the man who violates it. He must be very certain of his facts and very clear as to his motives, before he can, on his own private judgment, rightly adopt a course which tends to imperil the whole fabric of civilization, and at once places him in conflict with the powers that be.

---

#### **A Flaw in the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion.**

We can readily understand, even before we turn our attention to the records of the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion, that it can hardly have been carried through without some infraction of the form or spirit of the law. No one seriously doubts that the majority of free Englishmen were averse to Reformation, when it was introduced. Any sanction of it, therefore, which pretended to rely upon the assent of the people cannot really have been in accordance with their mind. There must have been a flaw somewhere.

When we actually look into the history of this great revolution, we soon discover many unconstitutional proceedings. We are disgusted at the force used to obtain the assent of the Lords, at the manipulation of the elections for the Lower House, at a despotic Queen and Parliament defining for ever the religious beliefs of our country. Yet the victims of Elizabeth's penal statutes did not complain of these illegalities so much as of another, on which we are less likely to dwell. According

to an accepted principle in the English Constitution, a principle which Elizabeth had at first recognized in her proclamations,<sup>1</sup> no change could be made in the essential parts of that constitution without the consent of "the three estates of the realm;" that is, without the vote of the Church, the Lords and the Commons, the voice of the Church being given by the Spiritual Lords in the Upper House of Parliament. But the Bishops had voted unanimously against the laws which settled the religion of the country. Here, therefore, was a flaw, and it was felt as soon as the legislation was put into force.

On the 19th of June, 1559, the Spanish Ambassador writes :

They have just begun to carry out the law against the Bishops. It appears now that they find a difficulty in giving legal form to this deprivation, as the doctors [of law] here say that the Bishops cannot be deprived for disobeying this law, whose adoption and promulgation they always opposed and still resist, alleging that *it cannot be enforced, consistently with the custom of this realm, for it was made in opposition to the whole estate of the clergy.* They would not take this into consideration, as they ought to have done, before the Queen confirmed the Acts of Parliament.

On the 27th following, he adds :

[The Bishops] have been in fact deprived, for the opinion of the doctors [of law] still is that *they cannot rightly be deprived by the laws of this country for refusing to swear.* The doctors themselves also refuse the oath.

On the 13th of July, he further states :

They have begun to carry out the laws of this Parliament respecting religion with great rigour, and have appointed six visitors, who examine all persons to whom, by the Act of Parliament, the oath has to be administered. They deprive those who will not swear, and proceed against those who disobey. What they have done is to take the crosses, images, and altars away from the Church of St. Paul's, and all the other London churches. In the matter of the oath they encounter resistance as usual.<sup>2</sup>

It is to be feared that the country clergy, instead of imitating the courage of their Bishops,<sup>3</sup> did little to contest the legality

<sup>1</sup> She promised "consultation in Parliament by her Majesty, and her three estates of this realm." (Proclamation of December, 1558, in Strype, *Annals*, I. ii. 392.)

<sup>2</sup> Fuensanta del Valle, *Documentos Inéditos*, vol. lxxvii. pp. 201, 207, 220; *Spanish Calendar*, pp. 76, 79, 89.

<sup>3</sup> It is pleasant to see that this courage is now generally acknowledged. Professor Maitland, for instance, says: "The solidarity of the English Episcopate was as wonderful as it was honourable." (*Fortnightly Review*, December, 1899, p. 927.) I gladly acknowledge my obligations to this able article. Even Canon MacColl owns that "the nine Bishops who [voted] against the Uniformity Bill deserve all

of the religious changes. It is notorious that, despite their protests when free, they made a bad fight of it when pressure was brought to bear upon them. Yet resistance there was, the Oath of Supremacy was generally refused. So long, however, as any sort of conformity was obtained, Elizabeth's Government was at first satisfied, as it might well have been.

But as time went on and the Protestant party gained strength, the defective legislation of the first Parliament could be supplemented by fresh laws. In February, 1563, Elizabeth's second Parliament passed an Act which sanctioned and sharpened afresh the settlement of the year 1559. Even so, even though the Protestant Bishops supported these laws, the Catholics continued to insist upon the original sin which marked their birth. Bishop Bonner, for instance, the pluckiest of all the Catholics, was summoned by Horne, Protestant Bishop of Winchester (Southwark, where Bonner was confined, lay in that diocese), to take the oath. Bonner refused, and first among his pleas in defence of his refusal, was the statement that the oath "*ought to have had* the consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and also the consent of the Commons."<sup>1</sup>

Of what resulted from Bonner's arguments we know something, but not all. They at least secured for him a preliminary hearing, but whether this particular plea was held to have been valid does not appear. Intercession was made for him by the Spanish Ambassador, the oath was not urged, and so his life was saved, which would otherwise have been forfeit. Even as it was, he had to appear in court once every quarter, in order to obtain a reprieve till the next term, and this he had to do for over four years, that is, until within a few months of his death. It is pitiful indeed to think of the poor old man being so often dragged across London, followed by "a naughty, unruly multitude" of fanatics which "Dr. Horne and his accomplices purposely of malice caused then and there in the streets riotously to be assembled . . . in manifest and notorious danger of his [Bonner's] life."<sup>2</sup>

honour for their courage, and I am in full sympathy with what Professor Maitland says on that subject." (*Reformation Settlement*, 1901, p. 719.) See also H. Gee, *The Elizabethan Clergy*, &c., 1898, p. 31.

<sup>1</sup> Strype, *Annals*, I. ii. p. 5. Bonner meant (I presume) that the Commons were wrongly elected, the Lords constrained, the Bishops disregarded.

<sup>2</sup> Bonner's complaint in Strype, *Annals*, I. ii. 7. The judges' debate on his plea is in Sir James Dyer's *Novel Cases*, 1601, fol. 234. The interesting record of his trial and reprieves is in the *Coram Rege Roll*; 6—7 Eliz. Mic.; Regina rot. xiii. King Philip's humane efforts on behalf of the imprisoned Bishops may be traced through the *Spanish Calendar*, pp. 323, 334, 352, 360, 378, 384, 387, 388, 392.

In 1572 the unanimous opposition of the Bishops to the Elizabethan settlement, was used by Sander as an argument against Anglicanism, and the controversialists, who answered him, debate the significance of that fact in various ways. But as neither Sander nor they discuss it from a legal or constitutional point of view, we do not learn very much from them for our present purposes.<sup>1</sup>

The last paper now to be quoted is of a much later date, but for that very reason all the better proof of the strength and durability of the idea of illegality, which was produced in the country by the high-handed proceedings of the Tudor Queen. There was talk during the reign of Charles I., mischievous and foolish talk if you will, of the means by which Catholicism might be restored in case the King desired to do so, and in this connection we find among the *Clarendon State Papers* a curious paper, anonymous and undated (but assigned to 1634), on the illegality of Elizabeth's settlement. To overthrow that settlement the writer clearly prefers to rely upon the King's prerogative alone. But he also maintains that it might be annulled on the ground that the election of the Commons, who passed it, was not free, and he concludes :

Howsoever, *the omission of the Lords Spiritual* in such an important matter, is a good satisfactory ground for the people, in case it should be declared that, for default of that, the Act aforesaid [of 1 Elizabeth] should not have force by virtue of that Parliament.<sup>2</sup>

There is some difficulty in discussing a small point without exaggerating it. Let us not be guilty of that mistake here. Respect for the Church and the Churches sank so much during the Reformation epoch, that the idea of any Church being a really essential part of the State was soon put away, and men forgot that it had ever existed. Even before Elizabeth came to the throne the old constitutional place and power of the estate of the clergy had altered and declined. But as her first proclamations recognized its existence, those Acts of her Parliament were faulty which were passed in defiance of that estate, and in fact condemned it to extinction.

J. H. P.

<sup>1</sup> N. Sander, *De Visibili Monarchia*, 1571, p. 686. See G. Acworth, *De Visibili Romanarchia*, 1573, p. 196; B. Clerke, *Fidelis Servi responsio*, 1573, sig. L iv.; J. Bridges, *Supremacie of Princes*, &c. In his letter to Cardinal Moroni (1561) Sander strongly asserts that the Settlement is null, and need not be revoked by Parliament. (*Vat. Arch. Arm.* 64, vol. 28, fol. 259 b.)

<sup>2</sup> Edward Hyde, Lord Clarendon, *Collection of State Papers*, I. p. 92.



## Reviews.

### I.—INDIA AND ITS PROBLEMS.<sup>1</sup>

*India and its Problems* is the title of Mr. W. S. Lilly's latest work. As a former member of the Indian Civil Service, who has also kept up intercourse with the leading authorities on the subject, he is entitled to have an opinion of his own on Indian questions. He has set before himself a modest but useful aim which he defines in the words of Lord Bacon's introduction to his *Institutions*—to provide a book having "two properties; the one a perspicuous and clear order or method; the other a universal latitude or comprehension, that the student may have a little prenotation of everything." And in this he has succeeded, for by saying just enough and not too much, and saying it clearly, he has met excellently the wants of those English readers who feel a strange interest in our great dependency and yet have such vague ideas, if any ideas at all, of the serious problems affecting its welfare.

The book has five parts, one on the Physical Characteristic of the Indian Continent; one on its Races, their Language and Literature; a third on their History; a fourth on their Religions; and a fifth on the India of to-day. In a periodical like *THE MONTH* one turns naturally in the first place to the chapter on Christianity. The Protestant converts, all sects included, number about 500,000, the Catholic converts in British India about 2,000,000, to which must be added 300,000 in the French and Portuguese settlements. This number, if consoling in itself, is sad to think of when we compare it with the hundreds of millions who inhabit the Peninsula, nor are there present grounds of hope that the proportion will ever be inverted. Sir Alexander Arbuthnot, indeed, speaks from a ripe experience when, in a letter written for Mr. Lilly's book, he judges that Christian missionary effort is conferring an important benefit on the whole country, but he does not mean that this will result

<sup>1</sup> *India and its Problems*. By W. S. Lilly. London: Sands and Co.

from extensive conversions, and the words of the Abbé Dubois, a missionary of a century ago, hold good now more than ever—"the time of conversions has passed away." The introduction of a less patriarchal system of life, the multiplication of Christian sects, and above all the infiltrations of Western scepticism—a vivid picture of the effects of which Mr. Lilly gives in the words of an unnamed Indian gentleman—have now been added to the ever-standing difficulty of caste. On the other hand, the influence of Western ideas is certainly undermining the hold of Hinduism, and one problem of the future is to know what will take its place. On this Sir Alfred Lyall is quoted, who thinks it quite likely that there will be an extensive propagation of Mohammedanism. "The Mohammedan faith still has at least a dignity, and a courageous unreasoning certitude, which in Western Christianity have been imperceptibly melted down and attenuated by the disease of casuistry and by long exposure to the searching light of Western rationalism, . . . the vigour and earnestness of the message announced so unflinchingly by Mâhommed conquer the hearts of simple folk, and warm the imagination of devout truth-seekers." There seems truth in this, and it sets one thinking. The Catholic faith has known how to convert and hold entire populations, not only in Europe, but in America and Asia—as witness the Jesuit Reductions in Paraguay, the missions founded by St. Francis Xavier in India, many of which still last, and many similar missions founded by apostolic men of other Orders. It was because they could be administered on principles suited to the habits of races in their childhood. Now individualism invades all religions, and individualism in religion is disastrous to child-like races.

It is the fifth part of Mr. Lilly's volume that will be found most interesting, and there are several points on which it would be pleasant to touch. Such is the account of the irrigation works of Southern India, due so largely to the labour and the initiative of Sir Arthur Cotton, which have rescued whole districts from the fear of recurrent famines, and have indicated what needs to be done to save other parts of the Peninsula. Such is the account of the ill-effects of Free Trade, which has inundated the country with cheap goods from Manchester, and has caused the hand-weaving that supported so many simple peasants to be forgotten. Such too is the chapter on Fine Arts in India, which is perhaps from an author's point of view defective in being so largely made up of extracts from Sir George Birdwood's works,

a defect, however, which the reader easily pardons. On the North-West Frontier question the author is a distinct Russo-phile, and gives a clear statement of the features of the military problem.

---

2.—STUDIES ON THE GOSPELS.<sup>1</sup>

The distinction, or the contrast, between what has been called the new apologetic and the old may be said to lie in this. The apologist of the older school set himself to answer the questions: "How can the truth of the Christian religion and the claims of the Catholic Church be proved or demonstrated?" and: "How can the objections of rationalists (or of heretics) be refuted?" His *confrère* of the newer school proposes to himself a somewhat different problem. His question is: "How can men be brought to see the truth of the Christian religion and to admit the claims of the Church?" Only on a superficial view of the subject could these two problems be regarded as wholly or in all respects identical. Newman has long since reminded us that a man is not commonly brought to the truth by being "refuted" in a neat syllogism, and that to make a man or his doctrine the theme of a *reductio ad absurdum* is not usually the shortest way to his heart. To look at the rationalist not as an adversary to be routed but as a soul to be won over; to remember that the leading rationalists of our day are not rationalists only, but distinguished and laborious scholars, from whose patient researches there is much to be learnt even though in their conclusions there is much to be corrected; to bear in mind that if "the spiritual man judgeth all things" he is not dispensed from the necessity and the duty of taking the natural means for arriving at a sound judgment, and of distrusting all merely *à priori* reasoning until it has been brought to the test of comparison with concrete facts; these are some of the guiding principles of the "new apologetic." And it may be safely said that what the leading representatives of the method in question have at heart is not by any means the exploiting of novelties, but purely and simply the salvation of souls; and that the newness of their procedure lies, not in denying the cogency of sound logic, but in insisting that a man is something more than a logician, the soul more than the mind. Roughly speaking it may be said that the aim of the older apologetic, or that of

<sup>1</sup> *Études sur les Évangiles.* Par le Père V. Rose, O.P. Paris: H. Welter.

the text-books, is mainly academic, while the aim of the new is wholly apostolic. Between these two aims there is assuredly no contrariety; and whatever contrast may emerge in the pursuit of them ought to be no more than modal or accidental. If the "new" apologist refrains from using this or that argument—*e.g.*, from a particular text of Scripture—which may be found in some text-books, because it seems to him insufficiently grounded, various points may of course arise for friendly discussion; but within the limits of friendly discussion the matter ought surely to rest.

These remarks have been suggested by the perusal of a work by Père V. Rose, O.P., entitled *Études sur les Évangiles*; a work which unquestionably pertains to the literature of the "new apologetic," and which appears to us to be of first-class excellence in its kind. The purpose of this modest volume is clearly set forth in the Preface. It is the matured response of a Christian teacher to the difficulties not merely of a perplexed intelligence but of a troubled soul.

Ce livre est né d'une occasion. Un jeune français qui, pendant un séjour en Allemagne, s'était initié à la critique du Nouveau Testament, nous demandait, il y a deux ans, s'il était permis à un exégète catholique de dégager des seuls évangiles synoptiques les éléments essentiels de la doctrine de Jésus, et si les principales positions défendues jusqu'ici par l'orthodoxie n'étaient pas sérieusement menacées. Il nous designait spécialement les thèses de la Filiation divine, de la naissance miraculeuse et de la résurrection.

Sollicités et même mis en demeure de répondre, nous avons limité, pendant deux ans, notre travail libre aux problèmes indiqués. L'occasion de ce livre en explique la méthode et le dessein; elle en sera, au besoin, la justification.

The book consists of an Introduction and of eight chapters, having for their subjects (1) The Four Gospels ("Le Tetramorphe"); (2) The supernatural conception of Jesus; (3) The Kingdom of God, its spirituality and universality; (4) The Heavenly Father; (5) and (6) The titles "Son of Man" and "Son of God;" (7) Redemption; and (8) The Resurrection ("Le Tombeau trouvé vide").

In the Introduction the author depicts the state of mind of one who, having once fallen away from the faith, but who, disillusioned by the world, would find God once more, revisits the parish church of his childhood. The passage affords some matter for reflection on the subject of religious instruction and of popular devotion. The italics are ours.

Si ce penseur regarde vers le catholicisme, qui a été la religion de sa mère, quelque attendri que soit le souvenir de ses premières années croyantes, il hésite cependant, s'il ne recule pas tout à fait. Il lui semble que la marque superstitieuse fait tache dans l'ensemble des pratiques et du culte. S'il entre dans la petite église du village où il est né, il restera sans prière devant la belle statue qui lui souriait autrefois. Il entend le même cantique qui' avait ému son cœur et troublé sa sensibilité de douze ans, repris par d'autres générations d'enfants pieux. Il en avait désappris les strophes depuis longtemps, *parce qu'il avait expérimenté qu'il était impuissant à soutenir sa virilité*. Dans le monde, il a vu quelquefois l'élite pieuse se confiner en des dévotions respectables sans doute, mais où le Christ est oublié. *Les livres saints, ceux qui alimentent la méditation, ne sont pas l'évangile*. On leur a préféré les légendes des saints, surtout des saints candides du moyen-âge. La prière du chrétien moderne ne s'adresse plus au Père céleste, qui a été révélé par son Fils; elle n'est souvent qu'un rêve attendri devant les vierges et les bienheureux des préraphaélites.

Anxious to take such an one by the hand and to lead him back to the peaceful truth of Christianity, Père Rose surmised that one efficacious means of arriving at this desired result might be found in the attentive and sympathetic study of our Lord as He is presented to us in the Gospels; a study which while giving their due weight and importance to all the assured results of modern criticism would also bring to light the superficial or one-sided or exaggerated character of much which goes under that name. The true remedy for rationalistic criticism has seemed to him to be, not that indolent shutting of the eyes to all non-Catholic biblical research which enables so many excellent persons to pooh-pooh it with perfect satisfaction to themselves, and grievous disappointment to others who had looked to them for help; or that easy acquiescence in the imagined excellences of our predecessors which sometimes leads to the belief that they have provided ready-made answers to questions which they never had to face; but a resolute determination to study the documents at first hand with the same minute scrutiny and the same indefatigable industry of which the rationalist critics have in so many cases set a conspicuously admirable example, even where their conclusions are wide of the premises which they have so laboriously collected. The best way to answer Professor Harnack, he holds, is not to decry his methods but rather to adopt them so far as they are sound, and to show, by ambulatory proof, that they lead not to the Ritschlian desert but to the city of God, not to Berlin but to Rome.

To study a document as it should be studied, it is necessary in the first place that one should make an effort to understand clearly its main purport, lest we should seek from it what it does not profess to give, or overlook some portion at least of its main significance. Now, all secondary questions as to date and authorship apart, it is clear that the Gospels have for their main purport to set before us certain characteristic acts and words of an historical personage, and to do this not merely in order to record, but more specifically in order to promote, the very work to which He devoted His life. They do not merely give us, as it were, the profile of the Man Christ Jesus, but they set Him before us face to face, and this of set purpose and design. Through them He speaks to us, heart to heart, and the recital of His acts was not, in the intention of the Evangelists, a mere narrative of past events, but a continuous and enduring object-lesson for living men. And if the Gospels are to be studied to any good effect they must be approached with a full recognition of this their fundamental character. As Père Rose has well expressed it: "*La première démarche d'un homme qui est attiré vers Jésus-Christ, et qui est sollicité à croire en lui, nous semble être la démarche d'une conscience qui s'adresse à une autre conscience.*" "Master, where livest thou?" asked Andrew and John of Jesus. "Come, and see," was His reply. "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" asked Nathaniel of Philip. "Come, and see," is the answer which he too receives. "Who is Jesus, in whom I used to believe, and in whom I would fain believe again?" is the question of many a strayed soul at the present day. And again the answer is: "Come, and see." It is the function of the Gospels to introduce men, as it were, to Christ. And being thus introduced, what do they find, if they will but seek with a mind unprejudiced, a heart disentangled and free? "Modern critics who approach the problem of the consciousness of Jesus with the conviction that He was a mere man, that without His being aware of it His character and His convictions were shaped by His surroundings, hold that the Gospels are incomplete documents," and endeavour each in his own fashion to make good the supposed gaps in the psychological record, to trace the steps by which, as they imagine, He gradually attained to the recognition of His own Messianic office. But—

Cette analyse des antécédents de Jésus contredit l'histoire. Cette conscience, dont la formation a été décrite avec de si ingénieuses



hypothèses, n'est pas la conscience qu'il se connaît, et qu'il porte en lui-même. Il sent qu'il ne doit rien à ses devanciers. . . . Il ne revendique qu'une seule hérédité, l'hérédité divine. N'est-ce pas de plus jeter la suspicion sur sa sincérité et sur sa loyauté. N'est-ce pas le déclarer un inconscient, le plus obstiné et le plus dangereux qui l'histoire ait connu ?

The hypothesis of involuntary self-deception or hallucination cannot be seriously maintained. Such an illusion as this hypothesis would postulate could never have maintained itself against those manifold shocks of failure and defeat, and of failure and defeat so clearly foreseen, which made up so large a measure of the external human life of Jesus.

Les critiques qui excluent de la personnalité de Jesus tout élément surnaturel, le méconnaissent et le travestissent complètement, puisque lui ne se réclame qui de son caractère divin.

Some, indeed, like Renan, endeavour to make as it were some compensation for the denial of the divine nature of Jesus by exalting His merely human character and virtues.

Certes, on ne grandira jamais assez cet homme. Mais, de grâce, qu'on ne lui refuse pas la première des justices, l'attribut élémentaire auquel le plus humble de nous a droit, la sincérité et la loyauté. Comment ces critiques ne voient-ils pas que plus ils grandissent l'homme en Jésus-Christ, plus ils fortifient et accréditent le témoignage qu'il s'est donné à lui-même, touchant son origine céleste et sa filiation divine ?

With fullest consciousness He puts forward claims to human belief and universal allegiance such as no man before or since has dared to make, claims of which His office as the Messiah of the Jewish race form but a small portion, "une province, l'enclave juive, dans le domaine plus vaste de son apanage de Fils de Dieu." On these claims He insisted ; it was through His insistence on them that He was brought to the extremity which He had predicted ; and it was by His death, and His resurrection after death, that He triumphed. These are historical facts, partly plain and obvious, partly capable of demonstration, with which the rationalist critic must reckon, and of which, with his limited repertory of possible imaginary hypotheses, he can give no account. Moreover, the claims of Jesus on the faith and the allegiance of mankind are not an affair of the past. They are as urgent now in the twentieth century as they were in the days of Pontius Pilate ; they still confront

the earnest inquirer into religious truth, by whatever path he may travel; and they are as worthy now as ever they were of the serious attention of all who have not learned to admit them and to make them the rule of their lives.

The passages which we have quoted are all from Père Rose's Introduction. Into the various questions dealt with in the body of the book we cannot here enter. It is of the very essence of the author's method that for the purpose he has in view they cannot be summarily treated, but must be examined at leisure and in the light of modern biblical criticism. We must content ourselves with saying that every chapter will be found to be full of interest, and that those who have devoted the largest measure of time and attention to the study of the Gospels will be best able to appreciate the new and varied aspects under which they are here presented. It is with very special pleasure that we welcome, in the writings of Père Rose, with which we may couple those of his fellow-professor, Père Zapletal, so manifest an indication that the great Dominican Order, to which they both belong, is worthily sustaining the tradition handed down from the time of St. Thomas; the tradition of a strenuous determination to yoke to the service of the truth and of the Church the best culture of the age in which a man may happen to live.

---

### 3.—THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE GOSPELS.<sup>1</sup>

Father Power, we believe, has made, or is about to make, a very substantial contribution to our knowledge of the chronology of the New Testament. We are obliged to throw our tenses into this alternative form because the volume before us is only a first instalment of a much more extensive work, in which must be sought the fuller justification of the positions which the author here takes up. There can be no question that Father Power has investigated this intricate subject with altogether exceptional industry and the most thorough-going research, that he has taken into account certain elements of the complex problem which appear to have been overlooked by the most distinguished of recent chronologists, and that whether his

<sup>1</sup> *Anglo-Jewish Calendar for Every Day in the Gospels.* Being an Introduction to *The Chief Dates in the Life of Christ.* By Matthew Power, S.J., B.A. London: Sands and Co.

*The Date of the Crucifixion: Founded on the Kalendar of the Ancient Egyptians.* By the Rev. A. W. Bulbeck, O.S.B. London: Art and Book Company.

conclusions are ultimately accepted or not, they will at least have to be reckoned with and cannot be lightly brushed aside. If they are accepted, then the result will be nothing less than the reduction of chaos to order in a department of inquiry in which the interest of the matter in hand has hitherto been equalled by its obscurity.

We are sorry to be under the necessity of qualifying these words of praise and of welcome to Father Power's volume, by saying that he has contrived to shroud in a good deal of mystery certain propositions which would appear to have been capable of tolerably simple statement. By the somewhat tiresome process of eliminating slices of more or less extraneous matter which, on almost every page of the *Anglo-Jewish Calendar*, are sandwiched in between the strata of the main argument, we seem to get at the following results.

1. The Jewish Calendar professes to be based solely on astronomical principles, and to be purely lunar.

2. The circumstance, however, that the fifteenth day of Nisan, *i.e.*, the Passover, never falls on a Monday, Wednesday, or Friday (a fact or rule which is expressed by the mnemonic word *badhu*) shows that there must be some disturbing cause at work; since it is obvious that 15th Nisan, like 15th March, or any other day of any other month whatsoever, would, if determined by purely astronomical considerations, fall as often on Monday, Wednesday, or Friday, as on Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday, or Saturday.

3. The unquestioned fact of the exclusion of the Passover from certain days of the week shows that some device must be adopted by the official redactors of the Jewish calendars in order to prevent coincidences which *per se* would have been inevitable; and this device can consist only in the interpolation or the omission of a day in the mensual reckoning.

4. It would seem that the device actually adopted is to inset an additional day at the end of the month Heshvan whenever the following Passover would otherwise fall on one of the forbidden days of the week.

5. Although the exclusion of Monday and Wednesday from what Father Power calls "Passover-honours," is of relatively late introduction, the exclusion of Friday is, he holds, of pre-Christian antiquity; and therefore the possibility that this law of exclusion may have operated in the year of the Crucifixion, must be taken into account by biblical chronologists.

6. If it be admitted that some reminiscence of the true astronomical reckoning survived alongside of the official almanac, so that, under certain conditions, a given day might be counted either as 14th or 15th Nisan, then we should have in this double reckoning a means of reconciling the apparently discordant statements of the Evangelists, three of whom seem to imply that the Passover Supper was celebrated on the evening before our Lord suffered, while the fourth gives it to be understood that the eating of the Paschal Lamb was still in prospect on the morning of the Crucifixion.

7. In view of all the elements that enter into the problem, A.D. 31 appears to the author to be the only one that satisfies all the conditions postulated by what we know of the year in which our Lord died.

8. Incidentally various expressions and notes of time which occur, whether in the New Testament or in the writings of profane authors who allude to Jewish usages, are illustrated and explained by the ascertained characteristics of the Jewish calendar.

9. Finally, the author claims to be able to reconstruct this calendar for "every day in the Gospels." The calendar, so reconstructed, is given in detail on pp. 60—93, for the period extending from 1st Nisan, A.D. 26, to 6th Sivan, A.D. 31, *i.e.* (according to the author's reckoning), from the commencement of the public life of our Lord (approximately) down to the day of Pentecost.

It will be understood that we do not commit ourselves to an agreement with any one of these statements, except in so far as some of them approximate to self-evident propositions. But it has seemed desirable to disentangle them from the lists of authorities, the appreciations of the relative value of sundry chronological treatises, the acknowledgment of indebtedness to various persons and sources, the references to proofs which will be forthcoming at some future date, and other such matters, with which in Father Power's volume they are almost inextricably mixed up. In order to form a final judgment on his various hypotheses, it will be necessary to await the appearance of the larger work of which, as has been said, the *Calendar* is only a first instalment. To this work we look forward with much interest; but we most sincerely hope that before committing it to the press, the learned author will be at the pains to make the logical sequence somewhat clearer than it is in the present volume; and, among smaller details, we hope he will discard

the unlovely device of using in his text abbreviated titles of books (*e.g.*, *Rosh-hash.*, *sic*), which are unintelligible to the ordinary reader and exasperating to the student. In conclusion, we must add a word of very cordial praise on behalf of the singularly happy design which adorns the cover, and for which the publisher as well as the author deserve much credit.

The above notice was already in type when we received a pamphlet of 31 pages, by Father A. W. Bulbeck, O.S.B., bearing on a portion of the same subject, which is, however, approached from a quite different point of view. Father Bulbeck is as firmly convinced that the Crucifixion took place on April 7, A.D. 30, as Father Power is that the true date is April 27, A.D. 31, while the defence of A.D. 29 has recently been warmly taken up by a learned writer in the *Tablet*. Are we, therefore, to conclude, with Petavius, that it is wiser to say that we do not know the truth about the matter than to put forward any conclusion as certain? This depends on what is meant by the little word "we." The inexperienced may indeed well feel bewildered by the disputes of the doctors on an extremely complex problem. But to set up one's own limitations as a check or barrier to the courageous enterprise of others would be a particularly odious though not unknown form of intellectual pharisaism, against which it is well to be on one's guard. The only thing which those who are not specialists can reasonably urge upon any one who undertakes to set before the public the results of his own speculations or research, is the importance of taking account of the whole of the evidence, and of setting it forth in due perspective. This is what, as it seems to us, Father Bulbeck has not quite succeeded in doing. All that he has to tell us of the Egyptian chronological cycles is of interest, even though the argument be a little hard to follow. But when he comes to the point of bringing these calculations to bear on the date of the Crucifixion, with the seventy weeks of Daniel as a sort of middle term, one cannot help feeling that the principal place is being given to an argument which at best might be entitled to be regarded as confirmatory of results already arrived at by some more direct method. Father Bulbeck, like Father Power, has presumably mastered the whole question in all its bearings. But he has only set before us a small portion of the arguments that would have to be considered before a judgment can be formed. When each of the writers who have

been here mentioned has set forth his full case, it will be time for outsiders to say how far their several attempts to marshal the evidence in favour of their respective conclusions appear to satisfy the canons of the practical logic of probability.

---

4.—GUIDE TO THE WESTMINSTER CATHEDRAL.<sup>1</sup>

Such a book as this was plainly needed at the present time. Whatever may be the fate of a more ambitious literary venture in connection with the Cathedral recently announced as being in course of preparation, the wish of the general public, and the interests of the Cathedral itself, have wisely been consulted by the issue of an official handbook at the modest price of sixpence, in which, without any pretence at entering into technical details, the author has given, very clearly and succinctly, "the history of the Cathedral movement from the time of its conception up to the present." To many, at least of the younger generation, it will be news, and very interesting news that the idea of building a great Cathedral, worthy of the metropolitan see of the Catholic Church in England, probably goes back to the time of Cardinal Wiseman himself, and that it at any rate took shape within a month after his death. How Cardinal Manning took the matter up, purchased the ground, and postponed the commencement of building operations till he should have discharged a sacred duty to the children of the poor (a circumstance that should give to the poor a special interest in the Cathedral), and how Cardinal Vaughan has succeeded beyond all expectation in bringing to its structural completion a work which might, perhaps, have been expected to take half a century; such is the story which is here told. Full justice, it need hardly be said, is done to the distinguished architect of the Cathedral, Mr. J. H. Bentley, whose untimely loss we still deplore. The little book contains, moreover, a quantity of statistical information which greatly enhances its value, and which—so far as the statistics are concerned with ways and means—is calculated to stimulate the generosity of the faithful. The illustrations deserve the most cordial praise, the photographs having been taken under favourable conditions of light and from suitable points of view.

<sup>1</sup> *Guide to the Westminster Cathedral: A Brief Survey of its History from 1865 to 1902.* With Illustrations. London: Burns and Oates, Limited.



From the few words concerning the mosaic decoration of the interior which may be read on page 49, it might perhaps be concluded that the scheme set forth in some detail in the *Tablet* of December 28, 1901, and again in No. 11 of the *Cathedral Record* (June, 1902) has been definitely set aside. Whether this is so or not we cannot say.

---

5.—THE HISTORY OF A SOUL.<sup>1</sup>

Many French works have of late years made their appearance in an English dress, but few, we venture to think, of a more singularly beautiful and edifying character than *l'Histoire d'une Âme*.<sup>1</sup> It is the autobiography of a young Carmelite nun who, it would scarcely be an exaggeration to say, died in the odour of sanctity at Lisieux, on September 30th, 1896, at the age of twenty-three. Written by the express command of her Superiors, and devoid of the slightest trace of either vanity or self-laudation, it relates the story of her brief life in the world and in the cloister, all the secrets of her heart, all the records of God's dealings with her soul, in the most simple and unaffected manner. We have seldom come across a work which bears a closer resemblance to what one reads in the *Lives of the Saints*, or which more vividly brings before us the spirit and traditions of St. Theresa, as perpetuated in the Carmel of to-day.

---

*Literary Record.*

---

I.—BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

*The Silver Legend* tells some forty or more stories of the saints in language adapted to children. As specimens of the sort selected may be mentioned the stories of St. Christopher and how he won his name; of St. Lawrence and the treasures of the Church; of St. Geneviève and St. Germanus; of St. George and his fight with the dragon; of St. Elizabeth of Hungary; of the legend of the Holy Grail; of Joan of Arc. These are stories of which some are historical, others legendary, but all by their beauty have impressed themselves on the

<sup>1</sup> *The Little Flower of Jesus*, translated from the French: *Histoire d'une Âme*, by Michael Henry Dziewicki. London: Burns and Oates, Limited.

minds of generations of Catholics. It would be a pity if they were to pass into oblivion, but, on the other hand, there is the question whether we can continue to administer them to our children—those of them, that is, which are purely legendary, without offending against the rights of truth. The authoress solves the difficulty by an introductory chapter in which the difficulty is boldly faced and an attempt made to explain in what way they may be usefully regarded. It is to be feared that this chapter will be found too abstruse and subtle for youthful minds and will have the effect of mystifying rather than instructing them; and perhaps it would be better to tell the children simply that some of these stories could hardly be true, but that they were what people of former days had thought to be true about the saints in question, and were worth knowing because they are so beautiful and instructive. It may, however, be said with some show of reason that the explanatory chapter, though expressed in childish language, is intended as a guide for their teachers rather than for themselves. One thing is at least certain, that the stories are all well told, and make up a book which children are sure to like.

*Jesus Christ, God, God and Man* (Manchester: James Robinson) is a new edition of a translation of some of Père Lacordaire's Conferences. The fact that such a translation has been able to reach its second five thousand shows that it meets a want, nor is it wonderful that the great reputation of Lacordaire should attract readers. Perhaps the mode in which he presents his arguments is not as well adapted to the mental temperament of the present generation as it was to the generation he addressed, but those who will patiently read him through will profit much from his lucid and powerful vindications of the three great fundamental truths which form the subjects of these Conferences. The translation is, on the whole, well done, and runs smoothly, but the Translator's Preface should have been dated, for it was evidently written many years back, and at a time when it could be said, as it cannot be said now, that "the subject of the following Conferences is daily attracting increased attention in England." It is strange too to find on the title-page "Jesus Christ" (in red) "God" (in black) "God and Man" (in red), without any commas to divide the three titles.

*Fifty-two Psalms* selected from the Psalter, is edited by Father Hugh Pope, O.P., and published by the C.T.S. What is special about the Psalms as distinguished from the other

parts of the Old Testament is that, as St. Athanasius says, in words quoted by Father Pope, they "seem as a kind of mirror to him who recites them, a mirror wherein he may contemplate the moods of his own soul, and is thus enabled to recite the words with sympathy." It is this feature of the Psalms which has dictated the principle of selection for the booklet before us, for the fifty-two Psalms chosen are those which best adapt themselves to be the vehicles of Christian devotion. A difficulty which besets us when we have to recite Psalms from the Vulgate translation is that at times it misses the sense of the original, having been derived from it through the Greek Septuagint, and so perpetuating a defective tradition as to the vowel-points. Father Pope has tried to meet the difficulty by drawing on St. Jerome's very accurate translation from the Hebrew. We would cordially recommend the use of such a devotional manual as this. Prayers composed by uninspired writers have their value, which is often very great indeed, but for richness of thought and devotional sweetness they can never enter into comparison with the Psalms.

The Address delivered about a year ago by Mgr. Mignot, the Archbishop of Albi, at the re-opening of the schools of the *Institut Catholique* of Toulouse, has attracted a good deal of attention, and the C.T.S. has now brought out an English translation. The merit of the Address is that it marks out with a master-hand the work of the modern theologian, the attitude he should observe towards Church authority and towards secular sciences, the character of the progress in his own science for which he should work, and the rocks ahead which he has to avoid. The Archbishop is always scrupulously orthodox, as becomes his office, and yet shows a keen perception of modern difficulties.

*The Love of God* (C.T.S.) is one of the *People's Manuals* which the Cardinal Archbishop brings out from time to time. It is an abridgment of the first six books of St. Francis of Sales's celebrated treatise, formed by omitting large portions, such as the philosophical and technical disquisitions, and condensing even the parts which are incorporated. It is hoped in this way to popularize a treatise which in its complete form appeals only to a limited class of readers. His Eminence, in the Preface, explains that a fund left in his hands by the late Mgr. Weld, so noted for his devotion to the Love of God, has been used for the preparation of this little treatise.

*Easy Benediction Services* is No. 2 of the Church Music Series brought out by Browne and Nolan, and also sold by the C.T.S. Besides Benediction music, it contains music for a few of the most familiar Latin hymns and a few Plain Chant melodies. The music is given in the Tonic Sol-fa notation, and is always simple and easy, the aim of the series being to supply confraternities and rural church choirs with music within their power.

*Night Thoughts for the Sick and Desolate* (C.T.S.) are a collection of paragraphs specially appropriate for use in the evening, when the day's work or suffering is over, and "some message of peace, of comfort, and of hope" is needed, "filling the night with music after the cares of the day, and lulling the tired soul to rest in the arms of its Divine Lord." The thoughts seem solid and stimulating.

*The Ordinary of the Mass* (C.T.S.) gives just the text of the Ordinary, without comment or addition, evidently for those who like to hear Mass by following the very words of the priest.

*Presbyterian Union and Christian Unity* (Edinburgh: Owen and Boyd. London: Sands and Co.) is a tract by Father M. Power, S.J., and is for Scotch readers. It is suggested by the recent union movement among the sections into which Scotch Presbyterianism is split up. It appeals to the sound feeling which inspires those re-union movements, and contrasts the two ideals of union, the Presbyterian and the Catholic, to show which best meets the requirements of the Divine Word and the instinct of the devout soul. The argument is ably worked out and the tone is conciliatory.

Mr. Livesey's *Granville History Readers* (Books 2 and 3) (Burns and Oates) will no doubt serve well the purpose for which they were written. They cover the whole of English History from the first to the twentieth century. We should have thought that events of importance to Catholics might perhaps have received more space. The readings in verse are notably better than those in prose.

Lina Eckenstein's *Albrecht Dürer* (Duckworth) is a little book which will not fail to commend itself to every lover of the great German artist. The well-selected extracts from the master's letters and journals bring him most vividly before us, a hard-working, honest, enthusiastic craftsman. The thirty-seven illustrations do all that could be expected for his pictures.

At the price (two shillings) the book is of excellent value. Mantegna and other great Italians, who were Dürer's contemporaries, while envying his consummate skill in drawing and painting, regretted that he had not been trained on classical models. (pp. 126, 140—142.) The criticism is most just, but Miss Eckenstein (p. 107) defends her hero with a skill and spirit that will, we trust, reconcile all who need reconciling to the universal law, that even the greatest of men have their weak points. But who, alas, shall apologize for the poor painter's lapse into Lutheranism (p. 226)?

---

## II.—MAGAZINES.

### *Some contents of foreign Periodicals :*

STIMMEN AUS MARIA LAACH. (Sept. 15.)

The Holy Shroud of Turin. *J. Braun.* Culture and the Catholic Church (concluded). *V. Cathrein.* Thoughts on the Evolution Theory. *E. Wasmann.* The Düsseldorf Exhibition. II. *S. Beissel.* Reviews, &c.

LES ÉTUDES RELIGIEUSES. (September 5 and 20.)

The last years of Montalembert (2 articles). *G. Longhay.* Reform of Studies in Theological Seminaries (2 articles). *J. Brucker.* The Crisis of the Spanish Congregations. *P. Dudon.* Does an unjust law bind in conscience? *A. Belanger.* Are Métaphysics still alive? *L. Baille.* Fichte and the conscience of the present day. *L. Roure.*

LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA. (September 6 and 20.)

The question of the French Congregations and that of liberty. The religious revival in France (1814). The miracles at Lourdes, judged by faith and reason.

DER KATHOLIK. (September.)

Tertullian and the Roman Primacy. *Prof. G. Eiser.* The State of the Soul immediately after death. *W. Kohler.*

